THE WHIGS
AND OTHER ESSAYS

BY

JAMES SCOTT

AUTHOR OF "STUDIES IN IDEALS," "AN OLIVE LEAF,"
"RAILWAY ROMANCE AND OTHER ESSAYS," ETC.

The Whigs—Toleration—Compromise—Lord Morley on "Compromise"—The Dilettante and Books—The Countryside—Flowers—Boots and Shoes—Tramps—Adventure

THE WHIGS
& OTHER ESSAYS

By JAMES SCOTT

THERE are various published memoirs of certain Whig statesmen, but, so far as the publishers are aware, there exists no separate history of the Party or movement. Mr. Scott does not offer here a complete history of the Whigs, but he has rendered a real service in providing a succinct and graphic picture on a small canvas. He has traced their origins, the growth of their movement and the main achievements of their Party, and he has shown their lasting influence on British politics and statesmanship during an intricate and absorbing phase of British history.

The interest of the other essays in this volume is wide and varied, they have a freshness and variety of appeal which must awaken considerable sympathetic response. The reader cannot help being carried along by his enthusiasm. Right through the book there is a remarkable combination of lucidity, exposition and balanced judgment; and however one may differ from the author there is no mistaking his meaning.

THE WHIGS
AND OTHER ESSAYS

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

STUDIES IN IDEALS
AN OLIVE LEAF
RAILWAY ROMANCE
AND OTHER ESSAYS

THE WHIGS

and other Essays

BY

JAMES SCOTT

LONDON : THE RICHARDS PRESS LTD.
90 NEWMAN STREET, W1.
MDCCCCXXIX

Printed in Great Britain
by The Riverside Press Limited
Edinburgh

Prefatory Note

THE essays in these pages have, for the most part, grown out of Addresses which I have delivered on various occasions.

I have to acknowledge the courtesy of *Chambers's Journal* in allowing me to include in my essay on "Compromise" a portion of it which formed an article for that journal.

I gratefully acknowledge the help I have received in connection with the essay on "The Whigs" from my friends Mr John Maclean, Mr J. Liddell Geddie, and Professor Norman Macdonald of Wooster College.

J. S.

Contents

PAGE

I. The Whigs—

i. A Statement of Whig Philosophy . . . 9
ii. The Setting of the Stage 12
iii. Origins of the Terms "Whigs" and "Tories" . 14
iv. Whigs in the Periods of Charles I. and Charles II. 17
v. Whigs in the Periods of James II. and William I. 21
vi. The Whigs and the Union of the Parliaments of England and Scotland 24
vii. Whigs during Queen Anne's Reign . . . 27
viii. Whigs in the Reigns of George I. and George II. . 31
ix. Whigs in the Reign of George III. . . . 34
x. The Three Revolutions—North, Pitt and Canning 40
xi. Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Whigs . . 42
xii. The Environment of the Whigs . . . 48
xiii. An Estimate of the Whigs 51

II. Toleration 57

III. Compromise 112

IV. John Morley on "Compromise" . . 138

V. The Dilettante and Books . . . 151

VI. The Countryside 155

VII. Flowers 160

VIII. Boots and Shoes 167

IX. Tramps 176

X. Adventure 186

I

The Whigs

i. A Statement of Whig Philosophy

It has been said that "the whole history of Liberalism has been that of progression from Whiggery to Radicalism." In the evolution of political thought and progressive policy there has been a well-defined development from the Whig doctrines of the seventeenth century. Who were the Whigs, and what were their doctrines? How did the Whig party develop and for what political policy did it stand? How can its influence upon British national policy and government be traced?

We cannot accept as historically accurate the statement by Dr Johnson that "The first Whig was the Devil," for he hated Whigs with a devout hatred, and, in tracing the origin of the Whigs, we must look for evidence less prejudiced and a source less diabolical than his.

First, let a Whig speak of his own philosophy and policy from a pamphlet entitled *Comparison of the Spirit of the Whigs and Jacobites*, and quaintly described as: "The substance of a Discourse delivered to an Audience of Gentlemen in Edinburgh. December 24th, 1745."

"The principle that utterly constitutes Whig-

gism, and distinguishes the genius and spirit of all its genuine votaries from that of the Jacobites, their opposers, lies in this:—

"That all mankind are naturally free, that they are originally vested by God and Nature with an inalienable right, and along with that are entrusted with a power of governing themselves by common sense, and to elect their representatives and magistrates for that purpose: magistrates tied down in the exercise of their offices to the observance of certain laws formed and ratified by the people themselves, or by their representatives whom they empower to do so, and having at their head one man superior to the rest in dignity and power, bearing the name of the monarch or the prince, but limited in his powers, for his possession of them depending on the consent of the people and their representatives, and for his exercise of them accountable to their judgment.

"The Monarchy is no more than the high steward of the people's privileges, and the executor of the powers they have trusted in his hands.

"Whiggism unlike Jacobitism is not a party. To call it by that name implies every whit as much nonsense and absurdity as to say the human race is a party. It is in effect the very interests of mankind and of the whole reasonable creation that the Whigs contend for."

. . . . . .

"Every man has a definite right, not only to freedom, but to power and authority, more or less

depending on his possession of wisdom, valour and goodness."

. . . . . .

"Therefore" (the discourse concludes) "if there be the least spark of this divine flame of liberty glowing in any of our breasts, let us follow resolutely where it shows the way, and cherish it for ever like a vestal fire. With it, let us live; with it, let us die."

The Whig movement pertains to modern history. Lord Acton has described modern history as that which began at the close of the fifteenth and the commencement of the sixteenth century, and which is marked off by an evident and intelligible line. He points out that the modern age did not proceed from the mediæval by normal succession, with outward tokens of legitimate descent. "Unheralded" (he says) "it founded a new order of things, under a law of innovation, sapping the ancient reign of continuity." In those days, Columbus (1492) subverted the notions of the world, and reversed the conditions of production, wealth and power. Machiavelli (1469-1527) released government from the restraint of law. Erasmus (1516) diverted the current of ancient learning from profane into Christian channels. Luther (1517) broke the chain of authority and tradition at the strongest link. Copernicus (1473-1543) evolved a system of astronomy at once simple and consistent. Lord Acton concludes: "The like effects are visible everywhere, and one generation beheld them all."

ii. The Setting of the Stage

Two hundred years later, in the latter part of the seventeenth and the early part of the eighteenth century, in our own country, there broke from the long winter of ignorance, and the rule of authority and tradition, a springtime of revolt against authority, of inquiry after knowledge, and a consciousness of popular rights and liberty. During the seventeenth century there was accomplished a vast social and intellectual revolution "of which the overthrow of the Church and the execution of Charles I. were but minor incidents." The stand for popular rights associated with the names of Coke, Pym, Hampden and Sir John Eliot, and enshrined in the famous Petition of Right adopted by the English Parliament in 1628, evidenced what Buckle has termed "the general intoxication" of the period. It was an event which was eloquent in significance, that in the year 1660 the celebrated Royal Society was incorporated by Charles II. with the avowed object of increasing knowledge by direct experiment—that is to say, in the interests of "natural science" in contradistinction to "supernatural science." Notwithstanding the moral corruption in life and manners of Charles II.'s reign, there were established during that period great political principles. Forty years of agitation had produced the leaven that has leavened the world. The liberty of the subject was won by Whig enter-

prise, by the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679, as also the right of the people to be taxed entirely by their representatives in the House of Commons. The art of printing which had been discovered in 1480 had been regulated first by Royal Proclamations, then by the Star Chamber, then by the Long Parliament, but had secured freedom by the year 1695. The austere Puritan spirit was not dead. It was "one of the principal fountainheads from which the stream of Whig political thinking has descended." John Bunyan was writing his *Pilgrim's Progress* in gaol about 1665, and John Milton his *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* in 1667. Milton was upholding the right of free speech and unlicensed printing when he penned these words in his *Areopagitica*:

"There be pens and heads there, sitting by their studious lamps, musing, searching, revolving new notions and ideas wherewith to present, as with their homage and their fealty, the approaching Reformation; others as fast reading, trying all things, assenting to the force of reason and convincement. . . . Methinks I see in my mind a noble and puissant nation rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks. . . . Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties."

In his speech at the Old Bailey, in 1670, William Penn, the Quaker, who had been arrested for speaking and preaching upon the streets of London

without permission, defended the inalienable rights of Englishmen to freedom of speech.

The patriotic energies of Selden, Eliot, Pym and Hampden had established the constitutional boundaries of Royal power, but constant watchfulness was necessary to prevent encroachment on popular rights.

iii. Origins of the Terms "Whigs" and "Tories"

The stage was set on which modern party politics should play their part, and the parties known as the "Whigs" and "Tories" appeared. Their historical antecedents were the "Roundheads" and "Cavaliers," into which Parliamentary parties in 1641 were divided on the question of Church Reform. After the Restoration, these were the "Country Party" and the "Court Party." Hallam says the terms "Whig" and "Tory" were as old as the Long Parliament (which sat from 1640 to 1660). Certainly they were originally employed at the time of the Exclusion Bill (introduced in 1679 in the reign of Charles II. to exclude the Duke of York from the throne because he was a Roman Catholic). The supporters of the Bill were known as "Petitioners," who soon became known as "Whigs," and their first leader was the first Earl of Shaftesbury. They supported the Republican principle that all positive institutions of society are meant for the general good; they opposed the

Royal prerogative, and fought on behalf of political freedom and religious toleration. The opponents of the Bill were the "Abhorrers," who soon became known as "Tories." The Tory or monarchical maxim of government of the age is clearly put in a letter of Lord Danby, the minister of Charles II., against whom an impeachment in Parliament was brought, when he says: "Upon the subject of peace and war . . . His Majesty alone is at all times sole judge, and ought to be obeyed not only by any of his Ministers of State, but by all his subjects." The theory of the Tories rested upon a monarchy, as either the end, or at least the necessary means, of lawful government. On the other hand, the Whigs supported the right of the people to govern, and secured the liberty of the subject in the Habeas Corpus Act.

"Whig" and "Tory" by 1680 had become familiar words, and were retained as designations of the two opposite political parties. The nick-name "Tory" was bestowed on the Court party by no less a godfather than Titus Oates himself. It is said by one writer: "The Whigs discovered in Oates' revelations the means of fanning popular fury against the Court. The year 1675, which saw the defeat of Danby's attempt at a perpetual endowment to the English Cavalier system, saw also the birth of the Whig party. The name 'Whig' does not occur till some years later, but the thing was already in existence." Hallam says that though the names were as senseless as any

"cant terms that could be devised, they became instantly as familiar in use as they have since continued." Tories were said to represent "the old interest" and Whigs "the new interest."

The origin of the names "Whig" and "Tory" is curious and interesting. "Tory," it is said, was the name given to a band of Roman Catholic brigands in Ireland—"Papist outlaws."

One reputed origin of the term "Whig" is that it is a form of a Gaelic term to describe cattle and horse thieves. Another, that it is an abbreviation of "Whiggam"—a term used by peasants of the West of Scotland in driving their horses. Another, that it contains the outstanding initial letters in the Covenanters' motto: "We hope in God." Again, it is said to be a shortened form of "Whiggamor"—a nickname of the peasantry of the Western Lowlands of Scotland. At least, the name given to the march of 7000 Western Covenanters on Edinburgh in 1648 was the "Whiggamor-Raid," and we find the same name applied to the Covenanters of Bothwell Brig in 1679. In Dunnottar Castle, near Stonehaven, was a dungeon, known as "The Whigs Vault," and that vault (as Dr Smellie has said) "in the summer of 1685 was the beholder of sufferings which were more painful, and tyrannies which were less defensible, than those which the fortress of a feudal baron has seen in its long lifetime of despotism and unrighteousness."

"Whig," from being a term applied to the whole

of the Presbyterian zealots in Scotland, was transferred to those English politicians who opposed the Court, and treated Protestant Nonconformists with leniency.

Whatever its origin, "Tory" has been for several hundred years a hostile nickname, or a title of self-praise, of a great political party. Morley has said that "the Tories gained greatly by calling themselves 'Conservatives' after 1832." Modern members of the party sometimes affect to be offended at the use of the term "Tory," but this has been sanctioned and approved by a recent writer of a *History of the Tory Party* who says: "Where friends and enemies have combined to recognize a name for a body of political thought for two hundred and forty years, it is convenient and true to describe it by that title."

iv. Whigs in the Periods of Charles I. and Charles II.

John Locke (1632-1704), a great friend of the Earl of Shaftesbury, was the philosopher of Whiggism. His writings represent the quintessence of Whig doctrine, and he put into coherent shape the philosophy of the constitutional State.

One of the conditions imposed upon Charles II. before being restored to the throne of England in 1660 was liberty of conscience. It was, however, many a year after that date before such liberty was fully won, and the Whigs took for their

function, for a century and a half, to counteract the excessive power of Royalty.

The Earl of Shaftesbury opposed the "Court Party" of Lord Danby. In Shaftesbury's memorable phrase "Popery and slavery went hand in hand," and it was his work to combine men of all classes and characters to oppose these twin evils. It has been said: "If Danby invented the machine in party government, Shaftesbury discovered the art of organizing popular sentiment on a grand scale."

The "Green Ribbon Club," which was founded about this time by means of an extensive system of agents, journalists and pamphleteers, gave the tone with increasing authority to political England throughout the country, and played a part in English politics comparable to the Jacobin Club in France. It met in the King's Head Tavern, at the bottom of Chancery Lane, and of the Club Shaftesbury was the president and the soul.

In 1679 the Cavalier Parliament was dissolved; the Whigs swept the country—"though at an enormous cost in beer and gold"—and Danby was committed to the Tower.

Lord Acton dates the rise of the Whigs from the reign of Charles II. (1666-1685), and says: "The liberal ideas bred in sectarian circles here and in America did not become the common property of mankind until they were detached from their theological root, and became the creed of a party. That is the transition which occupies the reign of Charles II. It is the era in which

Parties took the place of Churches as a political force."

Lord Acton describes the "Court Party," known as the "Tories," thus: "In general, the old Cavalier families, led by the clergy and the lawyers, acquiesced in the Royal prerogative, the doctrine of passive obedience, the absolute and irresistible authority of that which Hobbes called Leviathan, meaning the abstract notion of the State. They had a passion for order, not for oppression; good government was as dear to them as to their opponents, and they believed that it would not be secured if the supreme authority was called in question. . . . At first they were simply defenders of Royal Authority against aggression, without any original ideas."

On the other hand, Lord Acton shows that the "Country," or "Whig," party was the party of reform: "They were the people excluded from the public service by the oath in favour of non-resistance. They believed in the rightfulness of the War which the Long Parliament waged against the King, and were prepared eventually to make war against Charles II."

Lord Acton's view was that that was the essential distinction between the Whigs and the Tories. The Whigs, he says, "thought it unscientific to destroy a real political force. Monarchy, Aristocracy, Prelacy, were things that could be made innocuous, that could be adjusted, limited, and preserved. The very essence of the new party was

compromise. . . . They were a little disappointing, a little too fond of the half-way house. . . . They became associated with great interests in English society, with trade, and banking, and the City, with elements that were progressive but exclusive, and devoted to private, not to public ends. So far as they went, they were in the right, ethically as well as politically. But they proceeded slowly beyond the bare need of the moment. They were a combination of men rather than a doctrine. . . . General principles were little apparent in the system."

Another writer says it was a "series of historical accidents by which the great Whig families were thrown in the Liberal camp and long detained there. As grantees of the Monastery lands, they were originally bound by interest to the Protestant cause, and to the political party which upheld it. They were thus arrayed in opposition to the Romanizing Stuarts."

Hallam, in his *Constitutional History of England*, points out that the terms "Whig" and "Tory" have been loosely applied, sometimes to factions and sometimes to principles, and that the principles are rather to be traced in writings than in the debates of Parliament. Both parties agreed in the maintenance of the Constitution. But to a Tory "the Constitution was an ultimate point beyond which he never looked, and from which he thought it altogether impossible to swerve; whereas a Whig deemed all forms of government subordinate to the

public good, and therefore liable to change when they should cease to promote that object. . . . The Whig had a natural tendency to political improvement, the Tory an aversion to it."

To the Whigs liberty, the rights of mankind, the privileges of the subject, the freedom of the Press, freedom of inquiry (especially in religion) — in short "amelioration"—were all-important. Hallam was himself a Whig, but he was an impartial historian, and after stating Whig principle he adds: "It is one thing to prefer the Whig principle, another to justify or to advocate the party which bore that name."

To the Tories the mischiefs of sedition, the rights of Kings, the Crown's prerogative, the support of the Church were their first and constant care.

Hallam's judgment is that "the Whigs appear to have taken a far more comprehensive view of the nature and ends of civil society; their principle is more virtuous, more flexible to the variations of time and circumstance, more congenial to large and masculine intellects." And he holds that the Whigs, in so far as they were guided by Whig principle, were "far more friendly to the great interests of the commonwealth then their adversaries."

v. Whigs in the Periods of James II. and William I.

On the death of Charles II. there followed the short reign of James II., from 1685 to 1688. One

writer dates the rise of the Whig party as late as the close of James II.'s reign. He says: "A little more caution and policy in the second James would have been fatal to us; or James remaining what he was, who can divine what would have happened if there had been no William of Orange to displace him? In this crisis of extreme peril to England was Whiggery born." The observance by the historian of the dates of accession of kings and queens must not be taken in every case as precise dates at which national movements began or ended. No doubt these events greatly affected Parliamentary and party politics, but they did not always have relation to the course of national movements or turning-points of history. Men and movements proceeded whether kings lived or died.

At the Revolution Settlement, when William of Orange became King of England, in 1688, a political revolution, bloodless and undramatic in character, was enacted. The nation was in revolt against the illegal means by which James II. sought to exalt the importance of a small Roman Catholic minority. National consciousness had now become more marked and assertive. The Whig influence in carrying out the Settlement was very strong. In securing the new King's adhesion to the Bill of Rights the Whigs put upon the Statute Book one of the most important laws of our country. Of the House of Lords at that time Mr Lecky says: "It is probably no exaggeration to say that the steady Whig preponderance in that House

mainly secured the Revolution Settlement during the long period of the disputed succession."

The Whigs also stipulated as a condition of William receiving the throne that he should consent to a Land Tax, and in 1689 such a tax was imposed, and annually reimposed, at 4s. per £ on property, and in 1691 it was reorganized, much to the disgust of the county gentlemen whose estates had grown in value, and were now accurately valued.

Macaulay was bred and reared in Whig environment, and believed in the Whig philosophy; but as a great national historian he could be critical of Whig politicians when his impartial judgment demanded.

Macaulay points out that "the Revolution had altered the whole system of Government. Before that event the Press had been controlled by censors, and the Parliament had sat only two months in eight years. Now the Press was free, and had begun to exercise unprecedented influence on the public mind. Parliament met annually and sat long. The chief power in the State had passed to the House of Commons."

The Whigs of that time showed none of the finer instincts of forgiveness of enemies, and were remorseless in retribution. They saw no use for the Bill of Indemnity proposed by William, but they at least showed courage and fearlessness in opposing the King in the matter. In his second Parliament the Whigs were considerably reduced

in number, and the Bill of Indemnity was passed, and this contributed to the bloodlessness of the Revolution. In 1696 the first united Whig Ministry was formed, the Whigs being the predominant party in the Commons. But towards the latter part of William's reign the influence of the Whigs waned, and in 1700 William was compelled to form a Tory Ministry. One reactionary change attempted by the Tories then was that "No minister or placeman was to sit in the House of Commons, and State business was to be transacted in the Privy Council." Had these provisions been carried out, the development of Cabinet Government would have been checked, and the Executive would have been separated from the Legislature. But William was able to dismiss his Tory ministers the following year, and the Whigs again came into power with a large majority. Hallam, in remarking that the Whigs soon forgave the mistakes and failings of their great deliverer, says: "Indeed a high regard for the memory of William III. may justly be reckoned one of the tests by which genuine Whiggism has always been recognized."

vi. The Whigs and the Union of the Parliaments of England and Scotland

Although one sovereign reigned over both Scotland and England, Scotland had still her own parliament, which she had regained after the

Restoration. Scotland had for long been in the grips of Covenanting persecution at the hands of England; she had lost her trade privileges, and was a comparatively poor and backward nation. The failure of the Darien or Panama Settlement Scheme, which Scotland promoted but was unable to defend, accentuated the growing estrangement from England. It was apparent that, despite the Union of the Crowns, the two countries were drifting apart. The Scots were zealous for their nationality and Presbyterian form of Church government, and the Whig element in the country was strong. Matters reached a climax in 1703, when an Act of Security was passed in the Scots Parliament, refusing to accept, on Queen Anne's death, the ruler chosen by England, "unless the Sovereignty of this Kingdom, the frequency of its Parliaments, and its religious freedom and trade be secured from English or any foreign influence." This was a step which England could not disregard, and while trade and other reprisals were taken by England, the English Government appointed commissioners to treat with Scotland. As a result of their efforts, a union of the parliaments of the two countries was effected in 1707.

One of the commissioners appointed from England was Daniel Defoe, who, as a notable Whig, is worthy of special attention. Although world-famous as the creator of the immortal romance of *Robinson Crusoe*, he is little known as a politician. As one of the chief supporters of William III., he

has been called the "Cobbett" of the Revolution Settlement. He was a prolific writer, his total publications (mostly in the form of pamphlets, then in vogue) being over two hundred. He was, throughout his whole career, the steady advocate of progress, the manly and upright champion of justice and tolerance. He stood forth boldly in defence of popular rights. He advocated a plan for the promotion of Friendly Societies—a plan which contained in embryo the societies, savings banks, and mutual associations so familiar in modern times. He was a Constitutionalist, and opposed the Divine Right of Kings, which he considered to be entirely subversive of the Divine Rights of Man. He fought tyranny and oppression. It is said he was introduced to King William by the fame of his work *The True-born Englishman* (of which some eighty thousand copies were disposed of in the streets of London). In that work he discouraged vain reliance on the merits of rank and ancestry, and silenced absurd pretensions to superiority over other nations. He was a master of satire and irony, but, it was said, "neither Whig nor Tory could understand irony"! It was said by Addison that "De Foe, the first of journalists, changed opinions as the Queen changed ministers"; but Defoe was "a brawny, resolute, substantial Englishman," and "an adorer of the truth." On the subject of the projected Union of the Parliaments he wrote voluminously. Scotsmen who now feel aggrieved at the effect of the Union upon

Scottish interests will be grudging in their appreciation of the part Defoe took in carrying through the Union. But they will err on the side of generosity in remembering that he was an Englishman, that he no doubt acted, as he thought, for the best, and that he was deprived of that "wisdom after the event" of which they have the advantage.

vii. Whigs during Queen Anne's Reign

By the time Queen Anne (1702-1714) ascended the throne, Toryism had made a definite advance from the Cavalier Toryism of the Stuarts to the eighteenth-century Toryism, which recognized limitations upon absolute monarchy and the Royal Prerogative. The more progressive Tories, like Harley and St John, were accordingly found in coalition with the Whig junto. It is noteworthy that the Whigs of these days were far more of the Jingo than the Tories. They strongly supported a war policy throughout the War of the Spanish Succession, which dragged on during the greater part of Queen Anne's reign. The Tories of these days, on the other hand, did not favour the active intervention of Britain in Continental disputes.

By 1710 the English nation had wearied of the Whigs and their war policy. Their prestige also suffered by their impeachment of Sacheverell, the Tory parson, who is said to have been the greatest

blackguard of his day, but who had preached political sermons against the Whigs at Oxford and in St Paul's. He went about London with a mob at his heels demolishing dissenting meeting-houses. But the impeachment was ridiculous, and only converted Sacheverell into a martyr in popular sympathy, for he was only nominally punished. Yet for so much did popular frenzies and their consequences count in these days, that there was almost civil war, and a Legitimist Restoration!

The central idea of the Whigs, "the lawfulness of resistance to unlawful authority," was not a democratic one, but it warranted them in opposing any violation of the Constitution.

"The Clergy in Queen Anne's reign were divided into Latitudinarians and High Churchmen. The former—who were mostly Whigs—held most of the bishoprics, and the latter—who were almost exclusively Tory—composed the vast majority of the clergy as a whole. The influence of the High Church clergy in inflaming the minds of their parishioners against the Whigs penetrated to villages reached by no literature save the monthly news-letter, and to men who could not read De Foe and would not have understood."

Queen Anne herself was a Tory at heart, and showed it. She had a strong antipathy to the Whigs, and very unwillingly bowed to their will when their party was in power.

Modern Parliamentary debates and proceedings, although still conducted in the jealously guarded

precincts of the House of Commons, are brought directly before the people of this country, and even of the world, in an incredibly short time. By the aid of shorthand-writers, the Press, and the telegraph, speeches may be read within an hour, or a few hours, of delivery. The tape machine clicks out a précis of the speech which may be read while the speech is being delivered, and a speech as it is actually being delivered may even be broadcasted within the actual hearing of millions of people. An attentive electorate may at any rate be informed hourly of what its elected representatives in Parliament are saying and doing.

Contrast the conditions which existed in the days of Queen Anne. There was no Reporters' Gallery then in the House of Commons, and Parliamentary proceedings were not reported. Reports were written up afterwards, and Dr Johnson, as a young man, earned a living in this way. He always took care (as he said) "that the Whig dogs had the worst of it." Speeches influenced only those in the Houses of Parliament who heard them. The public outside could be reached only by means of the Press and the pamphlet. "The pen was therefore a more formidable political engine than the tongue." Political leaders had to employ literary talent, either their own or others', to spread their views among the electorate. "The great Whig leaders had strengthened their party, and raised their character, by extending a liberal and judicious patronage to good writers." The most

distinguished of these was Joseph Addison. He is in the front rank of literary men, and it is often forgotten that he was for many years a Member of Parliament, and held office as Secretary of State. He was no speaker, and his wit and eloquence were useless in debate. But as a pamphleteer, and writer of political articles and verse, he performed invaluable service to the Whig party. Addison was throughout his life a firm, though a moderate, Whig. Swift, his contemporary, was a zealous Tory. During the 1710 General Election, Swift conducted a political journal called the *Examiner*, and Addison published an opposition paper, the *Whig Examiner*, of which five numbers appeared. Some years later, Addison pitted himself against Sir Richard Steele in an argument on a Whig Bill for limiting the Royal Prerogative in creating peers, Steele, in a paper called the *Plebeian*, vehemently attacking the Bill, and Addison, in the *Old Whig*, refuting his arguments. It was upon such methods of political warfare that each party sought for victory.

For propagandist purposes the Whigs had a society called the "Kit Cat Club," and the Tories one named the "October Club," in which they respectively fostered their political opinions.

Macaulay sums up the achievements of the Whig Government which fell in 1710: "No body of men," he says, "had ever administered the government with more energy, ability, and moderation; and their success had been proportioned to their

wisdom. . . . They had made England the first power in Europe. At home, they had united England and Scotland. They had respected the rights of conscience and the liberty of the subject. They retired, leaving their country at the height of prosperity and glory."

viii. Whigs in the Reigns of George I. and George II.

On the death of Queen Anne—that historical event to which, as the veriest zero of mortality, all dead movements are compared—the Whigs' opportunity again came. It was known that George I., the Elector of Hanover, favoured the Whigs, and a long Whig ascendancy was assured during his and his son's reigns, covering nearly half-a-century. The King was an out-and-out foreigner, and could not even speak the English language. More and more, therefore, the government of the country fell into the hands of the King's ministers, and Cabinet Government took shape. The Whig party of these days included many great noblemen and the bulk of the "moneyed" classes of merchants and manufacturers, and also the Nonconformists. The Tories of these days were the party of the smaller landowners and the country clergy. The Whig party was strong in Parliament, and predominant in the House of Lords—incredible as this may seem to moderns. It was the Whig aristocracy which exercised control of government,

and which Disraeli afterwards nicknamed the "Venetian Oligarchy."

The Whigs established their hold upon the burghs, under the influence of the great landowners, and a firm Government was secured which could keep in check, and practically set aside, the power of the Crown. In foreign affairs the Whigs favoured an active policy to push the commercial interests of the country. An alliance with France, the ancient foe of England, was actually arranged in 1716, which soon developed into the Triple Alliance of England, France and Holland.

Sir Robert Walpole was the leading minister for twenty years from 1721, a "blunt and commonplace" statesman. A man of outstanding moderation and a famous parliamentarian, he was the first great commercial minister since the days of Thomas Cromwell. Burke testifies to his immunity from political corruption. Walpole asserted the privileges of the Commons against the Lords, further changing the national centre of gravity to the House of Commons. He broke with the tradition—although not the practice—of controlling the commercial interests of the Colonies. In later times he would have been a Free Trader, for his efforts were directed to open the channels through which British exports and imports flowed.

William Pulteney, one of the most thoroughgoing Whigs of the reigns of Queen Anne, George I. and George II., in a speech in Parliament in 1738, "speaking freely" (as he said)

denounced the practice of maintaining standing armies, as the creatures of the Court faction in times of national tranquillity: "A standing army is an evil more apt to grow than decrease. . . . Standing armies have been the destruction of liberty. . . . Though King Charles II. upon his restoration established but two regiments of guards . . . yet the Whigs of those days . . . found great fault with that establishment, and looked upon it as an innovation dangerous to the liberties of the nation. . . . No man can say our Constitution is secure when it is in the power of the Court to overturn it at any time they have a mind. . . . The keeping up of standing armies debases the spirit and courage of the rest of the people. . . . Our King may enjoy the hearts and affections of the generality of the people, and yet fall a sacrifice to the unjust resentment of his army. . . . The gentlemen of the army are apt to begin to look upon themselves not as the servants, but as the lords and masters of the people. . . . In a free and civil government the law-givers must always take care to pass in laws but what may be executed by the civil magistrate, assisted by the civil power of the country, or what we in this kingdom call the *posse* of the county. . . . We may see the difference between a free government supported by the power of the people only, and an arbitrary government supported by a standing army."

Brave sentiments these, and worthy to be the

foundation upon which to rest the constitutional principles of Britain's greatness! Free government by the people, the necessary submission of the military to the civil power, popular liberty as the security of the Constitution—these are the rights for which William Pulteney contended in his day.

ix. Whigs in the Reign of George III.

The Tories had seemed to favour the Jacobite risings of 1715 and 1745, but after these risings came to nothing, the Tories no longer pretended to be Jacobites. The Whigs of Walpole's day began to die out, and from 1742 to 1760 English politics were very uncertain. It has been said that "Walpole had left the nation sunk in the sleep of material prosperity. Pitt awakened it to new ideals of self-sacrifice and imperial duty." The "refined and supercilious" Pitt, however, "set his face like flint against the jobbery and 'family' politics of the Whigs."

One writer has said: "The main achievement of the Whigs (during the first half of the eighteenth century) was the system of Cabinet Government, based upon the support of an organized party in Parliament. It had reduced the Monarchy to a sort of crowned Presidency in a free state. It had secured a degree of freedom in belief, in speech, and in writing, such as had scarcely ever been enjoyed by any community in the world's history. But the power of the Whigs rested

upon Crown patronage for the purchase of support, and upon the exclusion from the public service of every man who differed from the ruling group. The view of Bolingbroke in *The Patriot King*, on the other hand, was that the Crown be restored to the position designed for it in the Revolution Settlement as the real need of the Executive, free to choose the best men for ministerial posts irrespective of party. This view was held by Pitt, who hated the Whig Oligarchy."

George III. succeeded in 1760, and by 1763 the Whig phalanx was broken. The King was a Britisher, but being opinionative, and desiring to govern as well as to reign, he tried to impose his own will on the nation. He was the last English king to attempt it.

"The Parliament of 1761 was the first for nearly fifty years in which the Whigs could not count upon a sure majority. The placemen now did not look for any instructions how to vote to the Whig leader, Newcastle, but to agents of the King."

By 1770 the Whigs were at their lowest ebb in history. One writer says: "With the accession of George III., Toryism took a new form. The struggle with the Dissenters was now a thing of the past, and the King was accepted as leader in carrying on the attack on the power of the great Whig families. The latter had split into factions.

"For some time, the dividing line between Whigs and Tories was this:

"The Tories asserted that the King had a right to choose his ministers and control their policy, subject to the necessity of securing a majority of the House of Commons, while the Whigs thought that the choice should lie with the leading members of Parliament and that the King should have no controlling power.

"The real conflict was between the corrupt influence of the Crown and the influence of the clique of great landowners resting on possession of electoral power through rotten burghs. In 1770 the King had his way, and established Lord North at the Treasury as his nominee. The Whigs, deprived of power, improved their position by the loss of one great instrument of corruption, but they were weakened by the establishment of two distinct currents of opinion in their ranks.

"The main body under Rockingham was influenced by Burke to begin practical reforms, but set its face against any popular changes in the constitution.

"The Whigs who followed Chatham wished to place Parliament on a more popular basis by the Reform of the House of Commons."

The King's attitude plunged Crown and Parliament into personal, constitutional and political quarrels. These largely centred round the name of Wilkes. Wilkes was a Member of Parliament, "a demagogue, worthless, profligate, a poor speaker, but a brilliant wit," but for eight years (1763-1771) he was the storm-centre of discontent against

the King and his Tory ministers. In No. 45 of the *North Briton* newspaper he violently attacked "The King's Speech" (which exercise is now regarded as a harmless pastime). The King—quite unnecessarily—took offence, and ordered him to prosecuted. He was arrested (which was illegal), and on pleading privilege he was released amid popular rejoicings. He escaped to France, and on venturing to return, in 1768, he was imprisoned as an outlaw. Riots occurred, and he was released. He was elected for Middlesex, but could not take his seat, as Parliament declared him ineligible. Petitions poured in protesting against the action of Parliament; the famous *Letters of Junius* joined in the attack; and a movement for Radical reform began. Wilkes had been treated with vindictive tyranny, and against that British public opinion and sense of fair play rose in rebellion.

The Earl of Oxford has pointed out that "this was the first significant triumph of popular agitation." Some even date the rise of modern Radicalism from the Middlesex Election dispute, but there continued to be Whig ministers until 1865. At any rate, during the election, a "Society of Supporters of the Bill of Rights" was formed, which was the first public organization for a political end. Wilkes subsided into obscurity after being allowed to take his seat in 1774, but the agitation about his return gave birth to a demand for Parliamentary reform. The House of Commons was not to be allowed to decide disputed elections.

Protagonists like Edmund Burke and Charles James Fox belonged to the old Whig party, but they were rapidly remoulding it on more democratic lines. In Parliament the movement for Parliamentary and franchise reform was spreading. It was an historic advance, even, that a public opinion was beginning to be formed, still more that it was striving to become articulate.

There is, however, some danger in studying political history from the point of view solely of Parliamentary government or succession of Royalty. We must also have regard to the expansion of Britain throughout the world, and this factor will be found to affect powerfully the conduct of affairs at home. Sir John Seeley remarks: "When Wilkes and Horne Tooke, Chatham and Fox are brought forward to play the parts of Prynne and Milton, Pym and Shaftesbury, the interest of the reader grows languid. . . . England was then engaged in other and vaster enterprises. She was not wholly occupied in doing over again what she had done before; she was also doing new and great things. . . . She, along with the other four Western States of Europe, was founding an Empire in the new world."

From 1761 to 1770 the Government was of a non-party character. Edmund Burke—of whom Lord Rosebery has said: "He was a Whig of the Whigs. He glorified Whigs. He inspired the Whigs. He was, if I may so express myself, the prose Poet Laureate of Whiggery"—in his

Cause of the Present Discontent demonstrated the necessity of *Party* as a means of giving system to a Government.

The "Audience of Gentlemen" in Edinburgh, in 1745, indicated the beginning, in Scotland, of Public Meetings, which are at once one of the manifestations of national liberty, a national safety-valve against revolution, and the opportunity for full and free discussion of opinion. In England, thirty-four years later, it was apparent that the era of public meetings for political ends had definitely arrived. Christopher Wyvell, a wealthy parson, persuaded the Sheriff of Yorkshire to summon a county meeting, which was held at York in December 1779. The nobles, gentry and freemen who attended, unanimously adopted a petition to Parliament in favour of "economic reform." The example of Yorkshire was followed by twenty-eight counties and a large number of cities and burghs. No such nation-wide demonstration had ever before been seen.

Although Walpole, in 1735, supported a resolution which was unanimously carried prohibiting the publication of House of Commons debates on the ground of the gross dishonesty of the reports, in 1771 the debates of Parliament were allowed to be published. The movement for Parliamentary reform spread. But reforms of many kinds were destined to be long delayed. The disastrous period of Lord North's Ministry followed (1770-1782) when, under the malign and foolish influence

of George III., the American colonies were driven into successful rebellion. A short Whig Ministry followed Lord North's resignation, to be itself succeeded by the notorious North and Fox Coalition, which ruined Fox's reputation for sincerity. Then came the flood-tide! One hundred and sixty Whigs ("Fox's Martyrs," as they were called), lost their seats, and the Whig party was wrecked for the time being. For forty-seven years—*i.e.* from 1783 to 1830—the Whigs were out of office—save for a short time in 1806. As Byron afterwards wrote: "Nought's permanent about the human race, except the Whigs not getting into place."

x. The Three Revolutions—North, Pitt and Canning

In that eventful epoch in world history there fall to be recorded three revolutions. The first was *political* in character—the American War of Independence (1775). The second was *social*—the French Revolution of 1789. It has been said that but for that Revolution the great Reform Act of 1832 might have been passed forty years earlier. On the other hand, Sir John R. Seeley expresses this view: "The modern political movement, that of Reform, or Liberalism, began not in England but on the Continent, from whence we borrowed it." The third was *economic*—the Industrial Revolution in England (*c.* 1795). These, one after the other, reacted violently upon the political

parties, cutting across old divisions, and reshuffling, modifying, estranging and reconciling, until out of the transition period the great body of placemen disappeared; the varied groups also vanished; and the Whigs and Tories, as the two great definite political parties, emerged.

Lord North's Ministry had been all that the King (George III.) desired. He had won a complete victory over the Whigs. His ministers became his creatures. Lord North broke down the theory of joint administration which had grown up under the Whigs. Gradually the complexion of the House of Lords changed—partly by the creation of new peers and partly by the defection of many Whig peers to the Tory party.

Still the Whigs continued their policy and kept up a guerrilla warfare upon the Government, urging economies, criticizing the conduct of the American War, and endeavouring to impose checks upon the corrupt practices which were tolerated in the politics of the times. Indeed, they succeeded in putting an end to direct corruption in the House of Commons.

In 1776 Adam Smith published his *Wealth of Nations*, which, as Professor Shield Nicholson has said, "in trade, finance, education, and religious toleration, has been the great armoury of practical politicians." Smith's work was a condemnation of Mercantilist theories, and a vindication of natural liberty and freedom of trade.

The conduct of Pitt the Younger, as an enlightened Whig—"nay a great Whig statesman,"

as Macaulay says, "from the end of 1783 to the middle of 1792—was that of an honest friend of civil and religious liberty." Yet, "he lived to be held up to obloquy as the stern oppressor of England and the indefatigable disturber of Europe." Under Pitt, the Tory party found it convenient to drop out of their policy the theory of the King's Divine Right. The system of Cabinet Government was restored to efficiency, and Pitt took the lead in asking for electoral reform.

Under Grenville, as Prime Minister, the Slave Trade was abolished in 1807, in the teeth of the most vigorous opposition from the Tories, and the merchants of Liverpool.

Ministries under Canning—"that thorn in the side of the Whigs"—and Peel followed; and in 1829 Catholic Emancipation was passed through Parliament. The passing of that Act, however, was a severe blow to the Tory party. The refusal of Wellington to listen to any proposal for altering the constitution of the House of Commons threw power once more into the hands of the Whigs in 1830. The Whigs then, as Disraeli said, "opened business with three favourite Articles, Peace, Reform, and Retrenchment."

xi. Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Whigs

By the eighteenth century, however, the character and composition of the Whigs had changed. The manifest interest of a privileged order of land-

owners, seconded by social influence and education, drew the Whig aristocracy and its following to the Tory side. The aristocratic and exclusive character of the Whigs gave place to more democratic representatives. Philosophic Radicals like Bentham, popular Radicals like Cobbett, Irishmen like O'Connell, literary men like Dr Samuel Parr, and industrialists and reformers in various spheres, were all now to be found in the Whig party.

Mr H. A. L. Fisher, in his Raleigh Lecture (1928), observes that: "In the course of the eighteenth century a change came over the intellectual atmosphere of Whig society. . . . The Whig party broke its connection with Puritanism. It became less narrow, more worldly wise and more tolerant."

Perhaps the enterprise for reform by the Whigs as a party slackened during the eighteenth century because the Whigs as individuals had achieved their own political and intellectual freedom.

The party's basis was being broadened, and it was as this process proceeded up to the point when a wide franchise was established that the modern Liberal party took shape. The process was no doubt hastened by the movement of discontent known as "Chartism," which began about 1832 and rose to its height in 1837 and 1838. Although that movement did not directly achieve much, it opened the eyes of political seers, and of the masses themselves, to the needs and aspirations of an awakening people.

The progress of the development was marked by the succession of reformative Acts of Parliament passed by the Whigs when in power—*e.g.* the Reform Act of 1832, Poor Law Reform, Anti-Slavery Acts and Factory Acts and, in 1845, the Repeal of the Corn Laws.

It was about that period that the "Whig" party began to be called "Liberal"; Liberalism became a principle of government; and the term "Whig" came to be restricted to the more conservative-minded members of the Liberal party, as opposed to the Radical-minded members. Individual Whigs, as members of a species, are by no means extinct even to-day; but, as a party of the State, the Whig party, by the commencement of Queen Victoria's reign, practically ceased to be.

The nineteenth century had not far advanced when there emerged an enfranchised British electorate, with ever-increasing enlightenment, education, culture, and industrial enterprise, and — it should be added — a keener sense of Christian brotherhood. The Whig attitude of mind became out of date, and its powers of direction of the new elements and forces in the State were hopelessly inadequate. The breath of new life had to be infused into the dry bones of a political party which stood for popular liberties and the rights of democracy. New weapons had to be forged against the massed monopolies and vested interests which barred the path of progress. The age-old moral sanctions of sincerity, justice, sympathy and

brotherhood had to be clothed with new interpretations, and had to inspire new watchwords. It was thus that men and women of every class of society were touched into newness of political thought and life, and became the great Liberal party of modern history.

It is unnecessary for our present purpose to record in detail the varying fortunes of the Whig and Tory parties, the one now displacing the other, and both at times being superseded by coalitions. The temptation must also be resisted of dilating upon the careers of individual Whigs—like Fox, Earl Grey, Lord John Russell, Lord Palmerston, Romilly, Sir James Mackintosh, Cobden or Bright. Rather is it necessary only to trace the evolution of the Whig party. "I am not a Whig," said Thackeray, "but how I should like to be a Whig!" Thackeray must have appreciated the ever-increasing tendency to progress amongst the Whigs, and discerned the coming of a still more progressive party out of it. Disraeli, on the other hand, wrote: "A Tory and a Radical I understand; a Whig—a democratic aristocrat—I cannot comprehend"; and again: "[The Whigs'] philosophy ends in a report, and their patriotism in a job."

On Lord Melbourne, Queen Victoria's first Prime Minister, a word may be permitted. He was an outstanding type of the last generation of Whigs. His mother had been a great Whig hostess, and on the triumph of the Whigs he became one of the leading members of the

Government. Mr Lytton Strachey has thus described him:

"By temperament an aristocrat, by conviction a Conservative, he came to power as the leader of the popular party, the party of change. He had profoundly disliked the Reform Bill. . . . He was far too sceptical to believe in progress of any kind. . . . Education at best was futile; education of the poor was positively dangerous. . . . Free Trade was a delusion; the ballot was nonsense; and there was no such thing as a democracy. Nevertheless, he was not a reactionary; he was simply an opportunist."

At least he was a Whig; and a Whig whose views were such as Mr Strachey describes can with difficulty be distinguished from a modern Tory. Perhaps he might have passed for a "Tory Democrat"—whatever that may mean. Lord Rosebery, writing of Lord Randolph Churchill in later days as a "Tory Democrat," characterized the species as "the Wolf of Radicalism in the sheepskin of Toryism." "Tory Democracy," says Lord Rosebery, "was an imposture, an honest and unconscious imposture no doubt, but none the less an imposture." So in Whigs like Lord Melbourne there was a strong admixture of Toryism in those early days of Victoria's reign. The passing of the Whig party had begun, and there were movements both to the *Left*, where the real driving force of the party lay, and to the *Right*, where the outlook may be described in Lord Melbourne's own theory:

"The whole duty of Government was to prevent crime, and to preserve contracts. All one could really hope to do was to carry on."

Here is Lord Morley's estimate of the Whigs of 1842: "By incompetent finance, by reckless colonial expenditure, by solving political difficulties through gifts or promises of cash from the British Treasury, by War, and foreign relations hovering on the verge of war and necessitating extended preparations, the Whigs had brought the national resources into an embarrassment that was extreme."

John Bright could say of the Whig Cabinets in 1848: "On the Treasury benches aristocracy remains supreme. No fewer than seven members of the Cabinet are members of the House of Lords; and every other member of it is either a Lord by title or on the very threshold of the peerage by birth or marriage."

Trevelyan says: "Cobden and Bright and the 'Manchester School' operated on the flank of both parties, greatly to the scandal of the Whig whips, who considered they had a claim on all Liberal votes to 'keep in the Whigs.' . . . On the side of Palmerston and his Whig followers the appeal to nationalist and warlike passions, and on the side of Russell his inability to redeem his personal promise of Franchise Reform, prevented the effective alliance of John Bright with the Whig Party."

In 1851, says Trevelyan: "The ministry of Lord

John Russell, which came into power in 1846 on the fall of Sir Robert Peel and the rupture of the Tory party, was visibly approaching dissolution, and with it the political domination of the great Whig families was doomed to pass away."

xii. The Environment of the Whigs

From about 1680 to about 1832—*i.e.* for about one hundred and fifty years—the Whig party played its not ignoble part in British politics. The historian is always on his guard—as we ought to be—against forming judgments or criticisms of parties or movements of far-off days by modern standards. Nothing could be more unjust. To judge fairly, we must stand where they stood, and, for that, wide and accurate knowledge and a sweep of imagination are needed. We must look carefully to our standards of comparison, and keep in view the limitations, the environment, the horizon, and the armoury of the times of which we judge. Similarly, we must purge our own prejudices and preconceptions as far as possible. But, in the end, it must be admitted that the subconscious influences, the incomplete knowledge, and the inadequate sympathies which must ever remain ours will render any judgments or criticisms we form liable to error.

When Sir Walter Scott, in *Old Mortality*, depicted with his pen of genius "the extravagance or narrow-minded bigotry of many of the tenets"

of the Covenanters, may we not hesitate to accept his verdict? Is that all that could be said of them? Did Sir Walter make sufficient allowance for the times in which they lived? Did he live over again in imagination their persecutions in all their bitterness? Did he realize the dawning light, and the ideals in their minds, which were the same "broken arcs" as ours will be considered in later ages of time? Were not their times such as demanded loud denunciations and the clash of arms, and would not politely worded murmurings and timid objections have been out of place?

So with due regard to all such considerations must we judge the Whigs. How unjust it would be to make any estimate of their worth and work without regard to their environment. In modern times the entire aspect of the nation has undergone stupendous change, by the discoveries and general progress of the age, and the complexities of modern civilization. Diffusion of knowledge and ideas, increased intellectual vitality, and greater refinement and culture have made the life of the nation pulsate with new vigour. But, in Whig times, there were no telegraph, no telephones, no railways, no steamships. National life moved at a comparatively slow pace. It was the age of the handloom and the stage coach. It was not till 1814 that *The Times* was first produced by printing machines.

In the management of public affairs there was no popular control. The municipal corporations

were largely self-elected and co-opted. The House of Commons represented property, and was almost entirely composed of members of the landed and aristocratic families. The House of Commons was hardly more representative of the people than the House of Lords. The total electorate of the United Kingdom was less than 500,000 men. Nowadays (with of course a population more than doubled) the electorate of men and women numbers about 25,000,000. There were in the House of Commons 200 members representing towns which had less than 100 electors each. In the "rotten" boroughs the handful of electors could be easily bribed. In the "nomination" boroughs the patron landowner chose the Member of Parliament. In the Government there was no ministerial responsibility. "Next to corruption" (one writer has said) "there is no more striking feature of early Georgian politics than the growth of mob violence. The slender electorate incorporated by the ballot were continually terrorized by disorderly masses of their unenfranchised countrymen." Accordingly, we cannot discuss Whiggism in terms of representative government.

Public opinion there doubtless was, but it was necessarily incoherent, timorous and localized. It was difficult and slow to form, as it was faint in expression and weak in influence. It was not until the Reform Act of 1832 that a beginning was made to secure real and effective representation of the people in Parliament.

The Whigs

Prior to 1832 we were not a self-governing people. It was then that the Liberal party came into being. The instinct of reform and progress, fostered and strengthened by every development of science and the quickening of thought in the nineteenth-century springtime, began to grapple with the problems of government. The movement strengthened and solidified with each victory it gained over reaction and anomaly. It challenged precedent; it dared authority.

xiii. An Estimate of the Whigs

Hallam, in a passage of consummate fairness, points out the confusion which has often arisen from applying the terms "Whig" and "Tory" now to principles or political theories and then to factions in the State. He rightly gives to the terms a moral significance, and a character such as would be found in upright and conscientious men. A Tory regarded the Constitution as "an ultimate point," whereas a Whig deemed "all forms of government subordinate to the public good." "The Whig had a natural tendency to political improvement, the Tory an aversion to it. The one loved to descant on liberty and the rights of mankind, the other on the mischiefs of sedition and the rights of Kings. . . . This made the privileges of the subject, that the Crown's prerogative his peculiar care. . . . The Tory was ardently, and in the first place, the supporter of

the Church in as much pre-eminence and power as he could give it. . . . He came unwillingly into the toleration, which the Whig held up as one of the great trophies of the Revolution. The Whig spurned the haughty language of the Church, and treated the dissenters with moderation, or perhaps with favour. . . . Again, a predilection for the territorial aristocracy, and for a government chiefly conducted by their influence, a jealousy of new men, of the mercantile interest, of the Commonalty, never failed to mark the genuine Tory." And finally, Hallam's verdict as to the Whigs is this: "I hold them far more friendly to the great interests of the commonwealth than their adversaries."

"The Whigs," says Macaulay, "learned moderation in office; the Tories learned the principles of liberty in opposition." The human element must be reckoned with in all our estimates and generalizations about the Whigs. Some men who became eminent Whig statesmen were ardent Tories in their earlier years, but changed their political faith by the compelling force of conscience and conviction. Other men who began as vigorous Whigs in later life waned to Toryism. And yet others were out-and-out opportunists of coalition mentality, unstable as water, and communicating their instability to whichever group of politicians they from time to time allied themselves. The vagaries of human nature are the main difficulties of the historian of parties or movements. The

standards of virtue and honour among the Whigs were no better than those of the times in which they lived, and those standards were not high. The Whigs had the root of the matter in them. Their instincts were with liberty and against oppression; with the people and against the tyrant in either Church or State. In moments of great crisis they took the right turn and decision. In the rough they hewed well.

But they, in common with all their contemporaries, judged and acted according to the standards of their times. Their victories for freedom were often marred by excess; their very zeal for liberty bred persecution. Too often they compromised, and their aim fell short of the sky. Nationalism they knew, but internationalism they had never explored. Popular right they understood, but the rule of democracy they had not fathomed. The power of the sword they used as freely as their political opponents. The notion of public right, the arbitrament of reason and justice in international affairs, if apprehended, was deemed too hazardous to be trusted. The Whigs embarked on wars and military expeditions on pretexts which modern Liberals would not own. They were corrupt in regard to vote-buying; they often abused party government.

Lord Acton has even said: "The 'patriarchs' of Whiggism were the most infamous of men. They set up the Monument to perpetuate the belief that the Catholics set fire to London. They

invented the Black Box, and the marriage of Lucy Waters. They prompted, encouraged, and rewarded the murderer Oates. . . . They were associated with the Rye House assassins."

Many of the Whigs were great nobles and landowners who had got grants from the Crown of the monastery lands. Therefore they even from self-interest (if from no higher motives) supported Protestantism. They also curbed Royalty and opposed kings like the Stuarts, who tried to exercise excessive power—because a king who was allowed to be a despot might despoil them of the lands by which they had come so easily. This explains the anomalous position of great dukes and landowners being Whigs and supporting popular demands and even revolution. When the limitation of monarchy became permanently secure, these dukes and landowners had no need longer to support popular demands. The tendency then became natural to become Tory.

The Whigs' economic ideas were often unsound; their activity in foreign policy was usually dictated by commercial interests. Whiggism was rather a complacent creed. It really meant the "cross-bench" mind. It has been said that "in the great days of the Whig families, one almost had to be born in Whiggery, and catch the authentic tone and flair from one's cradle."

There were, of course, Whigs and Whigs, just as there were, and are, Tories and Tories. There were "Old Whigs" (which name, one writer

says, was usurped by disaffected Tories) and "New Whigs." Some Whigs were among the seers and pioneers; others were time-servers and camp-followers; some had lion-hearts, others the craven spirits who will not leave the beaten track.

Listen to William Pulteney, a Whig of the Whigs, pouring scorn upon some of the faint-hearts: "I am surprised," he says (speaking in 1738), "to find that any man who has read the writings of some of our most eminent Whigs in former reigns can pretend to call himself a Whig, or that he is governed by Whig principles."

Macaulay, addressing the electors of Edinburgh in 1839, thus described the Whig party: "It seems to me I can discern a great party often depressed but never extinguished, preserving its constant identity, a party which, though often tainted with the sins of the age, was always in advance of it, a party which, though guilty of some crimes and errors, has done its best to promote civil freedom, religious toleration, civilization and social improvement."

An anonymous Whig in Edinburgh, in 1745, declared the right of every man (and politicians of all parties to-day hasten to add, "and of every woman") to freedom—nay, to power and authority—and added the sobering and chastening condition: "depending on his possession of wisdom, valour and goodness." Adult franchise, class-consciousness, mass-voting there may be, but it is not the vote, the class or the mass which endows,

but the "wisdom, valour, and goodness" of the individual citizen. If *he* have no wisdom, valour, and goodness, said this Whig, he shall have no power or authority in the State. Only as his wisdom, valour and goodness grow may he grasp power. As for himself, so for his chosen representatives. Not the tyrant, the intimidator, the blusterer, the schemer, or the trickster shall he send to Parliament, but the wise, brave and good man. On such a high plane of thinking, politics becomes merged in religion, an election becomes an ordinance, and the ballot a sacrament.

II

Toleration

THE changes of the years in the modes and manners, the codes and customs, of our own and other races make at all times interesting studies. The evolution of society, the growth of movements and tendencies, the development of rights and status form studies in history too often neglected. We distort history by slavish divisions of time into the duration of the reigns of monarchs, and by being hypnotized by their personalities, their intrigues and their love affairs.

We are here to consider the development of one tendency of absorbing interest—that of toleration. Toleration is defined in a respectable dictionary as "the liberty given to a minority to hold and express their own political or religious opinions and to be admitted to the same civil privileges as the majority."

We are to consider how toleration has developed in regard to various provinces of national life. We may neglect the less serious of these—for example, sport. We remember how, by Acts of the Scots Parliament in the reign of James I. in 1424 and James II. in 1457, both football and golf were prohibited in Scotland under penalty of fifty shillings; as the second Act said: "The futeball

and golf be utterly cryed downe." These sports are now tolerated! It is also now permitted to whistle on Sunday. Further, we have ceased to hang people for stealing sheep. Again, we need not seriously discuss people's pet aversions, their "minor damnabilities" which vex them and which they cannot "tolerate"—whether it be cats on the roof or in the garden, street organs, street singers (particularly those with falsetto voices), the cat's-meat man, rhubarb sellers, sweeps, coalmen, certain politicians, church bells, crowing cocks, hot plates, peppermints, onions or red herrings. People are always ready to throw either missiles or invective at their *bêtes noires*. But these are the minutiæ of superfine fastidiousness which should not count. Barbs should be blunted in these cases, and resentment should have a twinkle in its eye, and gradually give way to the virtue of patience.

There is a kind of lighthearted optimism which adopts Browning's words: "God's in His heaven —All's right with the world." That sentiment may be either the confident declaration of the deepest faith (as in Browning's case it doubtless was) or the shallow hope of a man as derelict in faith as he is careless regarding the world's fate. The latter case is typical of a trend of thought which in many quarters is so prevalent nowadays that it needs not to be sought. It is the philosophy of life which, existing in the background of the minds of many, may be found to explain much

that they do. It enables us to understand why they tolerate this or that, why they give licence to this other, or why in silence they endure what others would strive to abolish. This philosophy of life may not stop short of its logical conclusion, which is fatalism; but in its milder form the view is at least a comfortable one, and has the additional attraction of being at all times fashionable.

Probably if a Mr Buckle were tracing and delineating the tendencies of the present age he would give the foremost place to the persistent movement towards Freedom in the wide sense, which finds evidences on every hand. In all departments of life there is the breaking down of restrictions, the bursting of bonds, the shaking off of the restraining hand. The desire of this age is to obtain still greater liberty of action, more space to breathe and work, and wider opportunities of development. *Laissez-faire* is, in regard to conduct, in full operation. We may think, speak and write as we please. Our votes, though much canvassed, are secretly made, and it is through our own doing if they are known to others. The scope of the franchise is wide, and extends to what is practically full manhood and womanhood suffrage. The rights or claims of the democracy are constantly "on parade," and if the privileges of "the classes" are from time to time infringed, the resultant is always to give increased freedom to great masses of men and women.

Socialistic ideas have assumed a prominence

which they never before held. Democracy is thundering at the door of class privilege, demanding that the masses shall participate in the use and enjoyment of the land, and all other thrice-guarded privileges, and a fairer share of profits in industry which they help to make. The struggle between Socialism and Individualism is now acute.

Identical in spirit and origin, and cognate in its effects, is the spirit of toleration with which modern habits of thought and life are familiar. The embargoes of restraint laid on by previous generations are now in general questioned or resented. Their sanction and authority are investigated and tested by the spirit of the age. Free-thinking is stamped upon all that is now said or written in the realms of theology, philosophy and sociology. Irresponsibility and independence in individual action are features of the social life of the times. Slaves of fashion are not less numerous than formerly, but the fashions change more freely and quickly, and frequent revolts are spontaneously made by people in the mass against forms and customs whose existence has never before been challenged. In religion there is toleration of belief to an extent which often results in mistiness and want of definition, tapering off into unbelief. Religious observances have lost much of their obligatoriness, and, to the extent to which they are approved, a new sanction is found for them which is more utilitarian. Let the natural elements in man, it is said, have free course to seek their own outlet

and scope. Let both child and man develop in the way towards which he inclines, and let his legitimate desires be uncurbed. Traces of such tendencies are found in the educational, the socially regenerative, and the religious methods of the times.

In the ecclesiastical world the progress of toleration has ever been slow, but it has now become more perceptible. The emancipation of spiritual matters from civil control and the growth of voluntaryism have grown apace. Creeds and distinctions of sect are at a discount with many people, who would tolerate almost any religious beliefs (or none at all, for that matter) if men would but peaceably hold to their beliefs, and refrain from aggressiveness and proselytizing. They sit in smug complacency in the freedom and liberty which their forefathers won, and they often wonder at, more than they admire, the heroism and tenacity on behalf of the great causes for which their forefathers fought and died. Yet, on the other hand, most beneficent are the results which have flowed from the tolerant spirit in which many of the rival religious sects in our country now regard one another. Respect for and sympathy with differences of opinion upon matters of dogma or Church government have largely taken the place of the hatred and acrimony which such differences formerly engendered, and the sentiment of union has usurped the centrifugal tendencies of the past.

Toleration

As regards religious toleration, we may say that every form of religious worship which does not directly offend morality, and every form of religious opinion which is expressed in serious and decent language, are, in Britain, quite unrestricted. In many of the leading foreign countries there is similar freedom. Public discussion of the most fundamental religious questions is unfettered. But this satisfactory state of matters is the result of long and bitter struggles for liberty. The cynic, however, sees in them only graceless zealots fighting for "forms of faith."

The earliest widespread persecutions were those of the Christians by the Romans, but these were more "tribal" in character. The Romans found a secret society introducing a new religion. Its members refused to take the oath of allegiance, and looked beyond Cæsar to another King of their own, whom they worshipped. Such an illicit society was a menace to the ancient gods and to the Government. The vulgar crowd attributed magic to the society, and public disasters were laid to its charge. Hence arose the cry: "*Christianos ad leonem!*"

Theological persecution is, however, of comparatively modern date. Nowhere in the New Testament, or in the teaching or practice of the ancient Church, is any countenance given to religious persecution.

Sir Frederick Pollock has pointed out (see his *Essays in Jurisprudence and Ethics*, p. 144) that

the Roman Church has been able, with slight exceptions, to make persecution effectual only by means of the secular power: "the secular power which lent itself to this purpose was a joint agent, and must be held jointly responsible. However eager the clergy might be to stimulate and direct the anger of the faithful against heretics, their efforts would have been vain if the bulk of the laity had not been predisposed to persecute heretics when duly pointed out."

In his *Rationalism in Europe*, Mr Lecky gave an historical account of persecution in the propagation of belief, and the briefest *résumé* will suffice here. Mr Lecky points out that "The essential Catholicity of France was mainly due to the Massacre of St Bartholomew and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. England is justly esteemed the chief pillar of Protestantism, yet the English people remained long poised indecisively between the two creeds, till the skilful policy and the coercive laws of Elizabeth determined its vacillations. At the Reformation almost every Government prohibited one or other religion."

In France, although Henry of Navarre had himself accepted the Catholic faith, he, in 1598, granted toleration to the French Protestants by the Edict of Nantes. But under the Revocation, in 1685, of the Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV. the profession of Protestantism was proclaimed to be illegal and subject to the severest penalties. Dragonnades preceded and persecutions followed

this enactment. The Protestants had to flee from France to seek personal freedom and religious liberty in Switzerland, Prussia, Holland, Denmark, England and America. The peasants and the poorer classes had not the means to flee, and had to endure death, imprisonment or the galleys. It is believed that more than 1,000,000 Frenchmen suffered under the Revocation. The persecution continued for some seventy-five years, and even after that period the Protestants had to lead a kind of "underground" life, holding meetings "by night and sometimes by day in caves, valleys, moors, woods, old quarries, hollow beds of rivers, or, as they themselves called it, 'in the Desert.'" Yet the Huguenots were amongst the most industrious, enterprising and loyal of the citizens of France.

In Spain the Inquisition, which was the creature of the Roman Catholic Church, burnt people by tens of thousands, and condemned hundreds of thousands more to punishments less severe than death.

In the Netherlands, in the reigns of Charles V. and his son, some 75,000 were put to death for their religion.

In Scotland, John Knox, the Protestant Reformer, proclaimed the awful sentence, "The idolater should die the death"—which in plain language meant that every Catholic should be hanged. Queen Mary was publicly denounced for hearing Mass in her own private chapel.

Mr Birrell has said that in the matter of re-

ligious belief people take refuge in the Church of Rome so as to escape the necessity of making up their minds, distracted as they are by the conflict of opinions and facts. "Then it is," he says, "that the Church of Rome stretches out her arms." But of course they have to pay the price.

Mr Lecky said: "That the Church of Rome has shed more innocent blood than any other institution that has ever existed among mankind will be questioned by no Protestant who has a competent knowledge of history." Mr Lecky arraigns the saintly Augustine as the one who "consolidated the whole system of persecution, furnished the arguments of all its later defenders, and gave it the sanction of a name that long silenced every pleading of mercy, and became the glory and the watchword of every persecutor."

But the Protestant Church was by no means tolerant; and took reprisals on the Catholics when it had the power to do so. The clerical influence in Protestant countries was weak compared with that of the priests in Catholic countries. The Protestant persecutions were never so sanguinary as the Catholic, but with one or two exceptions the most eminent Reformers advocated persecution. Both Cranmer and Latimer had themselves been persecutors before they were persecuted. Gibbon considered that intolerance is a greater crime in a Protestant than in a Catholic.

It is said that the Reformers imperfectly understood toleration, but, as Mr Froude says: "You

must keep before you the spirit and temper of the men with whom they had to deal. . . . Toleration is a good thing in its place; but you cannot tolerate what will not tolerate you, and is trying to cut your throat."

Mr Lecky's view was that if men believe with an intense faith that they are right, and that those who dissent will be doomed by the Almighty, these men will sooner or later persecute to the full extent of their power. That view may be explanatory of the persecutions of history, but it is a questionable theory in modern times; with the growth and dissemination of knowledge, culture and constitutionalism, persecution such as the world once knew must recede.

The Old Testament records of Jewish legislators are bad examples for modern times and peoples—*e.g.* the massacres of Canaan, the slaughter of the priests of Baal, the forcible reforms of Josiah or the Levitical code. In the early Church, and in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, these were unfortunately accepted as models. Thus, after the Church obtained civil power under Constantine, the general principle of coercion was admitted and acted on against the Jews, the heretics and the pagans. Calvin and the Scottish Puritans appealed to the Old Testament for justification. The new life conception which Christ brought into the world was not then commonly understood or practised. Modern scholarship and criticism of the Bible have done magnificent service for the

Bible in setting forth its historical records in their true light as showing an evolution in men's thought and knowledge of God. The modern use of the Bible has resulted in a revaluation of Christ's teaching which is more in consonance with His Spirit. When Christ rebuked His disciples who wanted to call down fire from heaven like Elias on the misbeliever, He clearly indicated His separation from the intolerance of Judaism. But for many dark centuries men refused to credit that He did not come into the world to destroy men's lives, but to save them.

In England, from 1580, Elizabeth adopted offensive measures against the Romanists, when Jesuits in England plotted against her. A law was passed prohibiting any religious service other than the Prayer Book, the penalty for the third offence being imprisonment for life. Another law imposed a fine on anyone who abstained from the Anglican service.

In 1620 a body of independents, known as "The Pilgrim Fathers," to escape the restrictions placed on their religion in England, sailed in the *Mayflower* to found the colony of New England.

The law in England which condemned heretics to the flames was retained by the Protestant Church during one hundred and thirty years. Two Arians in the reign of James I. seem to be the last persons who suffered under it, but that law was not repealed until 1677. Although James I. was more tolerant than many monarchs of his age, yet Roman

Catholics were "forbidden to enter any learned profession, to hold any public office, or to attend the Court."

One of the terms offered by the Army to Charles I. which he refused was "That religious toleration should exist for all *except Roman Catholics*."

Under the Commonwealth there was religious toleration except for Papists and Prelatists. One of Cromwell's "Fundamentals" was that there should be liberty of conscience in religion. Under the Protectorate, for the first time, the idea was partially accepted that the State might permit differences of opinion between Protestants. With Cromwell guiding the administration and Milton the intellect of England, enthusiasm for liberty grew, and increased the demand for toleration.

Charles II. signed a declaration offering freedom of conscience before he was restored to the Monarchy. But, in 1678, Charles II.'s Parliament (after the Titus Oates Popish Plot) passed an Act disabling all Catholics from sitting in Parliament.

Although by 1679 Charles II. was persecuting the Scottish Covenanters because they refused to bow to Episcopacy, in Ireland Charles allowed the Catholics practical toleration. The Irish Parliament was, however, overwhelmingly Protestant, and so the Catholics were excluded from political power. All through the period of the Restoration the movement towards toleration continued,

but Dissenters endured many minor forms of persecution.

During the two reigns immediately previous to the Revolution, the Presbyterians in Scotland were persecuted most unmercifully and to the death—not by the Papists, but by their Protestant brethren of the Episcopal Church, which was then established in both kingdoms. Presbyterians were imprisoned, branded, mutilated, scourged, and exposed in the pillory. The Covenanters, men and women, were hunted like criminals over the mountains and bogs of Scotland. After enduring terrible persecutions in the cause of religious liberty, until it seemed that they were utterly crushed, their faith conquered. It was the freedom to worship according to their own beliefs and conscience for which they fought and died which was established in Scotland at the Revolution Settlement and is the heritage we to-day enjoy.

Here is Mr John Morley's glowing tribute: "To what quarter in the large historic firmament can we turn our eyes with such certainty of being stirred and elevated, of thinking better of human life and the worth of those who have been most deeply penetrated by its seriousness, as to the annals of the intrepid spirits whom the Protestant doctrine of indefeasible personal responsibility brought to the front in Germany in the sixteenth century, and in England and Scotland in the seventeenth? It is not their fanaticism, still less is it their theology, which makes the great Puritan

chiefs of England, and the stern Covenanters of Scotland, so heroic in our sight. It is the fact that they sought truth and ensued it, not thinking of the practical nor cautiously counting majorities and minorities, but each man pondering and searching so 'as ever in the great Taskmaster's Eye.'"

The spirit of toleration was gradually struggling for utterance. We find even one or two Popes of the Catholic Church endeavouring to moderate its severities. In France the principle of toleration had been avowed by M. de l'Hôpital (d. 1704), and many others. Sir Thomas More, in his *Utopia*, had extolled at least the abstract excellence of toleration.

The Test Act of 1689 enabled Nonconformists (except Unitarians and Papists) to worship in their own chapels. It gave Dissenters toleration though not equality, and it is justly regarded as the Magna Charta of religious liberty. Hallam remarks on the Test Act: "We may justly deem this Act a very scanty measure of religious liberty; yet it proved more effectual through the lenient and liberal policy of the eighteenth century." The Act was passed in spite of the opposition of the High Church party, one of whose writers, in a pamphlet of 1681, wrote: "Liberty of conscience and toleration are things only to be talked of and pretended to by those that are under; but none like or think it reasonable that are in authority. 'Tis an instrument of mischief and unsettlement. . . . To strive for

toleration is to contend against all government." Fortunately, this candid gentleman's views were found unacceptable; but he was at least right in this: that it is the weaker side which urges toleration—naturally. By this time, however, the spirit of religious intolerance was dying down. In the eighteenth century public opinion became more and more strong against the enforcing of persecuting laws: "Intolerance became an exception and an anomaly."

But nearly one hundred and fifty years elapsed before men of all religions or no religion were free to enter the service of the State. Catholics were debarred from full civil rights; their nobility and gentry, their men of fortune and education, were excluded from eligibility to Parliament and the higher offices of the State.

In 1778 Burke had secured the repeal of many statutes against Catholics which were becoming almost dead letters. In 1780 the Gordon Riots against Catholics took place, when London for four days was in the hands of its lowest classes and the mob sacked Catholic chapels and houses. But in 1792 Pitt secured freedom of worship and education for Catholics. The political emancipation of Catholics was urged by Pitt, Grenville, Plunkett, Grattan, Burdett, Castlereagh, Fox and Canning, against the opposition of the King, most of the lords, the universities and the bulk of public opinion. In 1829 the long drawn-out struggle ended, during the premiership of the Duke of

Wellington, and Catholics were admitted to all civil and military offices (except those of the King, Regent, Lord Chancellor and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland).

We may now consider how the Jews have fared in the matter of toleration. The Twelve Tribes, scattered abroad after the destruction of Jerusalem, had migrated and taken up the trades of pedlars and bankers. The Jews were the victims not merely of superstition but of jealousy, because of their riches and cleverness. Many Jews came to Britain in the course of the centuries.

Jews have not been kindly treated in this country, although our forefathers did not commit the periodical massacres of Jews which disgraced every country in Europe in the Middle Ages.

In 1290 King Edward I. expelled the Jews from England, where previously they had been tolerated, and about sixteen thousand Jews left the country for France and Spain. It was not until 1649 that a petition for their return to England was presented, and towards the close of the seventeenth century a small community of Jews was re-established in London. It was in that community, about 1748, that there appeared Benjamin D'Israeli, the grandfather of the great Disraeli.

An Act of 1839 removed the test of the Oath which contained the words "on the true faith of a Christian." A Jew might be High Sheriff of a county, or Sheriff of London, but not a Mayor or Alderman, or even a member of

the Common Council; but this anomaly was removed.

Jews were excluded from Parliament until so recently as 1858. Time after time, Bills to enable them to take their seats in Parliament passed the House of Commons but were rejected by the House of Lords. Jews like Baron Rothschild and Mr Salomons, duly elected by constituencies, appeared at the bar of the House of Commons but were denied the right of membership because the Oath contained the words "on the faith of a Christian." Finally, the pressure of public opinion even on the House of Lords became so strong that in 1858 an Act was passed enabling Jews on all occasions whatever to omit the words of the Oath.

Christians ought not to speak of "tolerating" Jews, whose beliefs have nothing in them of a moral or political character with which the law can justly concern itself. Christians perhaps differ among themselves on moral questions and sentiment at least as much as the Jews differ from them. Christians should never forget their indebtedness to the Jews and the Jewish religion, as the historical progenitor of Christianity.

The progress of toleration in this country was further marked in regard to Unitarians and Atheists. Unitarians received in 1813 the legal recognition which had long been granted to other Dissenters.

As regards atheists, Mr Bradlaugh's Affirmation Bill of 1888 was carried by a majority of one

hundred in an open vote in the House of Commons. Mr Bradlaugh was an atheist, and had been refused admittance even to a place in the House of Commons in the Parliament of 1880-1885. It was proposed in the Bill to substitute an Affirmation for an Oath in the case of unbelievers. This was indeed a triumph for toleration, by removing a sense of injustice in those who do not hold themselves responsible to any power higher than man.

In 1918, when Women's Suffrage was partially granted, a further step was taken.

Toleration in the sense of a frank and courteous recognition of social and political equality has now become one of the most genuinely approved rules of British civilization.

In France the intellectual basis of toleration is to be found in the great sceptical movement which originated towards the close of the sixteenth century, was promoted by men like Montaigne, Voltaire and Rousseau, and at last triumphed after the French Revolution of 1789.

Toleration is a growth of Modernism, and nowadays no body of believers of any kind could venture actively to persecute non-believers. This new code has been achieved partly by force of reason and partly by force of circumstances, and the experience of the inutility of persecution. It has been said that intolerance is just potential persecution — *i.e.* using "coercive measures to restrain a man, if not from holding certain religious

opinions, at all events from communicating these opinions to others." It is intolerance which is the positive active principle. But intolerance has gradually lost its old vindictive character.

The truths of religion are in a different category from, say, the facts of astronomy, and the truths of religion govern men's conduct to a large degree. If a religion is allied to the State, the aid of the State may be invoked to support or protect the religion. That is what history shows has been done in the past. But "Ecclesiastical fury is no longer armed with fire and sword." In the Protestant or Reformed churches are to be found separate sects of varying beliefs, each one of which stands for some particular aspect of religious belief, thereby contributing its quota to the sum of Truth, but all of them showing toleration towards one another.

In regard to the Roman Catholic Church this is not the case. In the Encyclical issued by the Pope in January 1928 he warned Catholics against fallacious religious unity which tends "to undermine the Catholic faith." The Encyclical says: "It is impossible to reach any compromise on truth revealed by God. Any human compromise would be treason which the Church of Rome has always resisted." The theory of the creed of the Roman Church is its immutability, but in reality its creed has undergone enormous changes down the ages. Human nature cannot resist mental development and change. But the Romanist still merges the

conscience of the individual in that of the Church. He is tutored to submit to his Church and never to judge it. The Encyclical says: "It is impossible to make any distinction among dogmas."

Yet within the Roman Catholic Church there seems to be toleration for its various sections of Benedictines and Franciscans, Jesuits and Jansenists, because they all bear allegiance to their one Church.

History has proved beyond question that to persecute men and women who hold opinions different from those accepted by a majority has resulted in the persecuted becoming martyrs, and in their opinions being more firmly held and disseminated. It is no doubt true that their faith or opinions may, by persecution, be temporarily eclipsed; that beliefs now generally held as instalments of Truth have been denied utterance; their acceptance delayed for centuries, and untold sufferings have been needlessly inflicted on those who witnessed for that Truth. John Stuart Mill says: "It is a piece of idle sentimentality that truth, merely as truth, has any inherent power denied to error of prevailing against the dungeon and the stake." But intolerance brings inevitably its own evil rewards. Intolerance breeds intolerance and rancour. Sincere believers under strain of persecution become fanatics, and from fanatics they become dangerous rebels against established government. The zealots display unexpected

heroism in defence of their beliefs, and their very resistance gains strength for their faith, which thus becomes more firmly rooted and established. Their numbers increase by the very fact of persecution. The pains and penalties and disabilities they suffer only stimulate them to greater endurance. A modern writer has said: "Intolerance has had a very successful career, and it looks like having a brilliant future, but it has nothing to contribute to Christianity." Nor, indeed, has it anything to contribute to everlasting Truth.

It is a mistake to speak of intolerance as if it belonged entirely to past ages, and other realms than Britain. Mr John Morley once wrote: "Englishmen [and he no doubt meant "the British people"], when in earnest, are as little in love with tolerance as Frenchmen or any other people." And John Stuart Mill says in his essay on *Liberty*: "The duty of toleration is admitted *with tacit reserves.*"

One of the most saddening reflections of a thinking mind is how near the surface are pagan instincts. Notwithstanding two thousand years of Christian teaching; notwithstanding all the civilization, education and culture of the ages; notwithstanding the momentum of moral and religious teaching of the present age; notwithstanding all the urge and uplift towards the highest planes of living—*miserabile dictu* every now and then, here and there, in the individual life and in the life of the community or the nation,

flare up the flames as from hell. It may be a murderous blow, or a diabolical outrage, or a fierce outburst, or a calculated cruelty of an individual. It may be the cataclysm of a revolution, or a General Strike in a nation. But there stands revealed, in all its stark nakedness of horror, the primeval unregenerate evidence of the lowest instincts of mankind. The savage only feigned that he was dead!

To those who best know the deceits, the mysteries and the unplumbed depths of the human heart, the marvel and the miracle is that the lower instincts and sinfulness of it are kept in such subjection as they are.

Not far beneath the veneer of culture lurks the demon of intolerance still. Persecution still raises its dragon head. Perhaps we may not persecute with the lethal weapons of former days: we choose more refined, yet not less galling, instruments of torture. There are various other ways of killing or maiming fellow-men or women than with a gun. You may break the heart by the slow torture of daily persecution; you may ruin a person's career; you may damage his business and prospects; you may blight his life or make it one long tale of misery; you may boycott and ostracize; you may thwart and rob; and all with a black cruelty of persecution which has its origin in intolerance, and may be done in the supposed interests of religious or political beliefs, or of industrial or commercial aims.

Let us, therefore, leave the Pharisee behind us when we consider this question of toleration, and let us keep a steady eye upon the long, tortuous and rocky path before us which winds up to "perfection's sacred heights." In modern times, with practically adult franchise, there is much less excuse for intolerance than in former times. Our votes get us the Government we ask for, and deserve.

Even in our appearance of toleration there may be a touch of arrogance, where a superior person who holds certain opinions "talks down" in regard to tolerating people who hold opinions different from his own. The reason of the arrogance is that the person has not grasped the possibility that he may be mistaken. There is, therefore, no humility about him. The fact is that the more one knows, the deeper the learning, the wider the range of experience, the more humble and the less dogmatic one becomes.

But we are at least more tolerant in our language and criticism of others. Our invective is not so brutal, and we do not now use such epithets as Milton used against his opponents (*e.g.* in his *Defences of the English People*). "Numskull," "beast," "fool," "puppy," "knave," "ass," "mongrel cur" are choice selections from his style. Erasmus too had a florid vocabulary of vituperation, and "blackguards," "hogs" and "knaves" are some of the terms he used. Such terms were, however, current coin of the age, and must be judged accordingly.

Toleration

That there are many and numerous forces at work in the world on the side of toleration to-day we gladly recognize. The diffusion of the highest religious teaching; the spread of knowledge and education of every kind; the culture of music and the fine arts; all the civilizing influences of science and invention, which result in raising the standard of human life and drawing the nations of the world and the classes of society in these nations into greater and more intimate contact; the study of languages; the improved and easy transport, which permits international and inter-class intercourse, bringing nations and classes into better knowledge and understanding of one another; and the teaching of experience—which shows that lenient and liberal measures conciliate and unite, and proves the wisdom of universal individual liberty.

The Press has been for many years, and will continue to be, one of the most powerful agents for promoting toleration. About 1865 there began to appear magazines containing signed articles by eminent writers on all kinds of subjects, on which various and opposing opinions were expressed. These magazines have multiplied ever since, and undoubtedly have exercised immense influence in moulding opinion. These magazines have circulation in all parts of the world, entering every kind of home, read by men and women of every shade of opinion or belief. Consider also the profound influence of the daily and weekly newspaper Press,

pouring out its variegated tale of events and opinions. Consider the daily stream of books poured from our publishing houses, treating of every kind of subject in every kind of way. What effects, far-reaching and overwhelming, must all these have on opinions and beliefs in these modern days, and in providing conditions in which the spirit of toleration may grow!

The cynic will no doubt add: "And what earthly chance has conviction to stand against them?"

A sense of humour ought to be an aid to toleration. It postulates a faculty of detachment which is invaluable. Between two disputants it acts as a third party. Either disputant may resolve himself into the attitude of the third party, and thrice blest is he who can assume the *alias*, and psychological may be the moment that he does it. If both disputants are so fortunate as to be able to assume a position outside the ring, then the chances of agreement, or at least of mutual toleration, are enhanced. At a moment of tension in an argument, or a situation, the person who can introduce the glint of humour casts a ray of heaven's light. The strain is at once relaxed, and stern and angry looks may melt into smiles, like late snow under an April sun. Of course, on the other hand, they may not, if there is no steel for the flint of humour to strike. A quarrel may have gone too far; feelings may be too bitter; and the atmosphere may have become too vitiated for humour to breathe.

It becomes then an intrusion, and is resented, and the humorist is execrated beyond his deserts, for undoubtedly he did well even to try.

Humour sees from an oblique angle. The quaintness of a situation, an absurd aspect of a struggle, a comical view of a proof or argument —any or all of these come with a healing like the balm of Gilead. Grim or sardonic humour is not of much use, because it usually emanates from a savage mind which is not to be deflected from its purpose. The more grim the less tolerant. It is not to be supposed that those who presided over the courts of the Spanish Inquisition would have been affected by humour, even if it could have been supplied; although it is related of Ignatius Loyola, the Jesuit, that he urged his junior colleagues to indulge occasionally in hearty laughter, saying "a saint sad is a sad saint." The Commissioners who persecuted the Presbyterian ministers and their flocks in Scotland in the seventeenth century with such dire hatred had minds foreclosed to any influence save misguided zeal for the policy of the ruling monarch and his advisers. The Covenanters themselves could have no thought except a dogged determination to resist to the uttermost an oppression which outraged their conscience and deprived them of religious freedom. The persecutors were under a mental obsession which was the negation of any healthy suggestion; and their victims' minds were filled with fear. In any struggle in which men's opinions or desires, or even principles,

have reached the stage of fanaticism; wherever there has been lust for bloodshed or torture; when the times have known only rugged sternness and uncouth manners and language—it were futile to expect that a sense of humour could have any place or cogency. Humour would then seem an irrelevance, and yet it is its very irrelevance which makes humour powerful.

A sense of humour is as old as mankind, but it has been denied its rightful place. It was tolerated in the king's jester, but seldom allowed to influence the king's mind. Humour as the sport of the hour, the sparkle of life and a plaything, could be understood, but as a helpmeet was never—or seldom—employed. Its place was in the common room or the street, but never in the Council Chamber.

How, it may be asked, could a sense of humour be permitted to mingle with the serious things of life? It is surely a contradiction in terms. It is said that in matters of government, policy, legislation, administration, and all the hidebound, soulless machinery of a Social Order, there can be no place found for the play of humour, though it be sought with tears. Some philosophers have taught that all morality is based on laughter. It is at least something to find a sense of humour active—to an extent—in business dealings, in transactions of buying and selling, in barter and exchange, and the myriad operations which constitute our commercial and industrial life. A sense of humour often

asserts itself as a real aid to business. It is possible to compose a wrangle over a price by some happy reference to a man's new suit, or his dialect. The offer of a cigarette accompanied by a smile to an infuriated visitor will often be more effective than even a soft word to turn away his wrath. What are wanted in the world are more mirrors so that people might see themselves as others see them. On different people the effect would be different. Some would be only stung into such annoyance that they would adhere more tenaciously to the views or standpoint they had adopted; others would recognize their position as untenable or absurd. The Irish people, for example, have plenty of wit, but little humour—that is to say, they cannot stand aside and look at and laugh along with others at themselves, and they do not like to be made the butt of humour. Yet it is just this sense of humour which is capable of preventing people going too far, pushing their opinions further than they are warranted, and thereby becoming intolerant of others. To relax the risible faculties is to relax the mind.

The development of a sense of humour should signify and accompany high culture and civilization. Many people are quite devoid of it, while others require to cultivate the sense of humour they have. One may have a natural genius for humour, and he is thrice-armed for many of life's battles. "Man is the only animal that laughs and weeps," says Hazlitt, and, clearly, humour is a God-given

faculty, which should be developed far more than it is. We are undoubtedly meant to use our sense of humour, like all our other faculties. It requires education in taste, refinement, feeling and fitness. Its aid should certainly be invoked in differences of opinion far more than is commonly done. Satan is no humorist, and on many an occasion his incitement to persecution or intolerance might be thwarted by the introduction of humour when feeling runs high, and acrimony seizes our minds. That is the moment when a glimpse of our incongruity is required, and it is humour which opens the window and shows the difference between things as they are and as they ought to be. It is then possible to see the folly and absurdity of some course of action we intend.

Toleration is, however, very apt to be merely a cloak for apathy. A reputation for being broad minded is often little more than an excuse for being indifferent. The sceptic's taunt is: "You have become tolerant because you have ceased to believe." There is an extraordinary want of seriousness in modern life, which is doubtless a reaction from the materialism of the War. We dread and shun an enthusiast as one who does not know "good form." One might almost be tempted to forgive some intolerance, if it resulted from downright earnestness and keenness upon things that really matter. Cycles of mental apathy appear in history, of which the Moderatism of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is an

illustration. After the turmoil of the War years, people's minds have not even yet settled down to realize the right proportion which the seriousness of life ought to maintain in relation to the joy of living.

Not for a moment ought we to abate the healthy zest and happiness of which life ought to be full; but there ought always to be a substratum of seriousness, upon which alone true joy can be built. It is this which gives a right balance, and prevents life from becoming vapid, featureless and barren. Not lightheartedness, but lightheadedness, is the evil. The ignorant will tolerate anything because they do not know the issues at stake. It is only when people begin to care very much about anything that they realize what other people care about, and find their faith or opinions to be the same as, or different from, their own.

There is also a great lack of moral courage, which may account for the seeming growth of toleration. People dishonourably tolerate, because they do not have the grit to condemn or to differ. We cultivate hypersensitiveness about other people's toes. Courage is born of deep conviction, which often seems to be at a discount. We fear to offend, or we fear the consequences to ourselves, and so we maintain a craven silence. We hesitate to "expel the coward, and enthrone the hero." We compromise, and enter into unholy coalition with opinions we distrust or despise, rather than take the risks of independent action,

and we escape our moral responsibilities behind a smoke-screen of assumed toleration.

We need no reminder that in some countries intolerance is rampant. In Soviet Russia, and in Italy, freedom such as we know in Britain does not exist. Intolerance in these countries and elsewhere stands in power, sword in hand. We have no right or title to interfere, and these countries must undertake their own responsibilities. But it is now a proud boast in Britain that we do not penalize British subjects on account of beliefs or non-beliefs, sex or colour. While this is true in the general sense, the rule is not wholly applied, and there are many anomalies to be corrected, and our toleration, like beauty, may be only skin-deep.

But although we are in the general sense to be tolerant, we must guard against certain improper tendencies. We may tolerate, and subject to no disabilities, those who hold different beliefs or no beliefs, but it is impossible to acquiesce in beliefs which we are firmly convinced are wrong. If we try to do so, the result may be to whittle down our own convictions and unsettle our own beliefs. Certainly, we ought to be open to conviction, but only on the merits. If we are convinced, after the fullest argument, that we hold the true, and they the false, we must stick to the true, even although the earth be removed and cast into the midst of the sea. We may not excommunicate those who differ from us from civil rights equal to our own, but that is no

reason why we should not argue and teach our own views.

Toleration is good, yet only within limits. The limits are often hard to find, and differ with almost every set of circumstances and of individuals. No rule-of-thumb is applicable to every department of life alike, and what may be legitimate in one sphere amounts often to licence in another. Toleration is prone to go beyond its depth, and at times it treads near the quicksands of confusion and despair. For example, in morals, distinctions between right and wrong become blurred. The edges of scruple soon get worn down.

The moral sense becomes blunted, and level-headed perception of things in their true moral aspect becomes difficult. In scarcely any other sphere are the lines of divergence so evanescent and delusive. Conscience, which once was unshakable in integrity, may be bribed. Its value may be belittled, its authority set at naught, its very existence and origin called in question. "What is Conscience after all?" asks the man in search of the bedrock of verity, who will accept no guidance save his own, and acknowledge no agency beyond what is within the perception of his own reason and senses. "Is conscience," he asks, "any other than the knowledge, which each man acquires by the experiences of life, that evil or disagreeable consequences follow from certain actions, and good or beneficent results flow from certain others?"

Toleration

On matters of individual conduct the way is fairly clear. In spite of every effort to whittle down distinctions, good and evil are still easily recognizable, and we must very obviously choose the good and eschew the evil. As Lowell writes:

"Wrong ever builds on quicksands, but the Right
To the firm centre lays its moveless base."

We must show no tolerance whatever to evil in our own individual conduct. The broad road still leads to destruction, and the narrow way to life. To reach life, we must often go along even a razor's edge, so narrow is the way. There is no place for turning back, and nothing save faith and hope to which to cling on the perilous way of conscience. At some critical moments even to look on evil with the eye of toleration may mean our soul's death.

It is conscience which must rule, and that "voice of God" points the way to goodness with sacred authority, and unerringly every time. It is at our peril we disobey. The cynic may endeavour to state the origin of conscience, as he will also venture to do of life itself, but he fails to explain either. They are facts of our existence which stand.

An enlightened conscience may be the result of evolution and growth through the ages, and may vary in character, in perspicacity, in responsiveness and resiliency, with the individual or the

race. Conscience may, and ought, to be educated, sensitized and attuned to the highest pitch. Mental and moral growth go hand in hand. Conscience may be developed through society, and the commingling of men with one another in all the varying conditions of human society. The individual conscience and the social conscience react upon one another.

What nameless crimes have been committed in the name of conscience! What oppression and intolerance have resulted because conscience has been unenlightened, or wilfully dulled. Yet we are hourly restrained from committing sins and crimes against society because of the restraints of the public conscience, which, like a moral policeman, has forbidden them, and which has, generation after generation, enshrined its disapproval of them in the Common Law and Statute Law of the country. It is, however, by individual acts of conscience that the public conscience comes into being, and it is here that the power of conscience is easily seen and felt. If an individual, upon whose inmost soul has flashed a light brighter than the noonday sun, speaks out straight from his enlightened conscience, saying, "This ought not, and shall not be," he rises at once above his fellow-men to a higher plane. Others see and believe, and so gradually from plane to plane the public conscience passes, under new sense of obligation, towards the higher standards beyond, and ever beyond. Not men's desires and appetites, but

their highest instincts speak through conscience, and point the way of duty. It is fraught with danger to ourselves and to our fellow-men to disregard the voice of conscience. The oftener we obey it, the clearer does its guiding light become. The oftener we neglect its leading, the weaker do our wills tend to become. Somnolence of conscience is the sleep of death. Equally dangerous is it for us to argue with conscience, or seek to cheat, or drug, or cajole, or soothe it to sleep, or seek to excuse ourselves from obedience. Our wills are our consciences put into action. The rights of conscience are not controllable by human laws, or amenable to human tribunals. Each man and woman stands at the Bar of Conscience—alone.

It is the recognition of this fact which exalts individualism into its rightful place of pre-eminence. It is true that, under all forms of representative government, the individual must delegate his responsibilities and surrender the decisions of his conscience to some extent. In Parliament, in local councils, in associations, in trade unions, the individual by his vote empowers delegated persons to act for him. Therefore, in electing them, every vote the individual gives becomes a sacrament, because of the issues affecting his own conscience which are involved in the act. But is it to be believed that at the great Day of Judgment it will be accepted from any individual soul as excuse, or palliation, that actions within his own control

were done according to instructions received from, say, the secretary of his Union or Association? If an individual must blush for wrongs committed in his name by his Government or Association or Union, will not a sense of burning shame compel and warrant him to speak out his condemnation of such wrongful actions? There his conscience must speak, or be for ever silent.

Our communal tendencies in modern society, which are no doubt invaluable for many purposes, must always have strict limitations imposed on them by the obligations of the individual conscience. The centripetal forces must never be allowed to eclipse individualism. Until a man has discovered himself in isolation he has not begun to live; he ceases to live when he surrenders his conscience. What of a man that the world, or even his closest friend, sees is but a fraction of his being after all. In some reserved lives it amounts to only the smallest portion, while it is greater in lives of a different mould. But in every case there is an external life and an internal life; a shell and a kernel; a body and a soul. Though a man leads the busiest of lives; though his hours be crowded with deeds and his moments with words; behind all, there yet lies a greater silent world, teeming with event and incident—an unseen expanse of thought and feeling. A man is judged by his fellow-men by what they see of him, and in the regular life of the world this is the only practical guiding line. It is the exception to seek to dis-

cover his motives and his thoughts, since to do so would probably be but groping in the dark, and there is thus the real danger of quite neglecting what lies beneath the surface. Since a man knows and expects that he will be judged by men only by what is open to them, his greatest care is to keep right and consistent on that side; he thinks that the incongruities in his inner life can be of no consequence, since that is not exposed to the critical gaze of the world.

Ever and anon, moments come in the individual's life when earth and its millions are for him non-existent. They fade away into littleness amid the infinity of his surroundings. In the whole Universe of time and space there exists for him naught but his own soul and personality—and God. The two, Creating Spirit and Created Soul, stand absolutely alone in the great grim silence of individuality, which the sounds of the material world cannot penetrate. In this presence there is no privilege, no class distinction, no exception; and the issues may be life or death. If the individual then elects and decides to act according to the dictates of his conscience, he emerges a new creature. Who climbs must climb alone. Each foothold gained in scaling these rugged heights must be reached and firmly kept by individual effort. Circling the highest mountain-tops in the eye of the sun, the eagle soars alone.

Having decided the line to be taken by the individual with regard to his own conduct according

to conscience, it becomes easier to decide his line of action on general matters of right and wrong. The question for the individual is whether a thing is right for *him* to do. He is not bound to answer the question for other people. Nor is he entitled forcibly to impose his own beliefs or opinions upon them. The right of private judgment must never be surrendered, and it is daily necessary for us to make up our minds, with the fullest information available to us, on all kinds of questions and problems which affect other people. "Our country, right or wrong!" is a toast which moralists cannot approve, but which some statesmen refuse to censure. Clearly we dare not surrender our right to judge whether actions taken in our country's name are right or wrong. "The Moral Law," says Mr Froude, "is written on the tablets of Eternity. . . . Justice and truth alone endure and live." Therefore, we must always strive to range ourselves on their side. Justice and truth are much more easily recognized than is generally admitted. Final and ultimate certainty may be beyond our reach, but the direction in which Truth lies is not so difficult to find. With the Golden Rule at our elbow, the love of our neighbour in our hearts, and a prayer for wisdom on our lips, we should examine every question honestly and fully, and then make up our own minds as to which is the right course of action and which the wrong. It is here that the problem of toleration as regards other people arises.

For example, it is easy to recognize crime and outrage, and they allow of no toleration. Any man worthy the name will blaze up in anger and resentment against foul vices and obvious breaches of the laws of humanity, and against them the utmost intolerance is not only justifiable but essential. Falsehood, treachery and deceit need to be trampled on. The criminal will be resisted and compelled to keep within the limits of the law. We cannot and must not tolerate anything before our own eyes, or within our own jurisdiction or sphere of influence, which is contrary to the first principles of justice and humanity. The outrageous invasion of Belgium by Germany in 1914, and the threat of German militarism to human freedom, rightly roused intolerance of what was intolerable. The very hint of slavery, black or white, ought to rouse us to a white heat of intolerance. The British Government has even imposed its will on the people of India in prohibiting the practice of burning widows on the dead husband's pile, and the crushing of pilgrims beneath the wheels of Juggernaut's car. Our human sympathies should always be on the side of the oppressed and downtrodden. Similarly any threat to our personal independence, from whatever quarter it comes, must clearly be resisted as intolerable.

It is now possible to formulate certain general rules with regard to toleration:

1. *On matters of opinion, as distinct from matters of conduct, we should be tolerant of others.* We may

tolerate other people's beliefs or opinions without in any way compromising our own. "We must put out on the unknown Ocean of completest possible tolerance." Men and women hate to be overawed, or to cower before the "tyranny of opinion," and we should never attempt to overawe other people. There should be the fullest liberty of contradicting and disproving each other's opinions. We may and do live in friendly intercourse with persons of different persuasions from us. On no other conditions would life be really tolerable.

Yet a word of caution here is necessary. Our intimacies are in a different position from our mere courteous acquaintanceships. We have an absolute right to choose our own society—*i.e.* the society most acceptable to us. We should, therefore, keep our intimacies for those who think as we do, whose code and sympathies are similar to ours, and who are trying to be faithful to the same principles and ideals.

One of the hardest tasks some people get is to suffer fools, and for the life of them they cannot do it gladly. Jackie (Lord) Fisher was such a person. "Fools," he said, "are an essential feature in the great scheme of creation." Our patience gets exhausted and we denounce them as intolerable, as perhaps they are. In the old days they would probably have lost their heads; to-day we merely lose our patience, and no great harm is done. Everything that tends to the development

of the human mind, to the spirit of impartial and unrestricted inquiry as the first condition of progress and truth must be tolerated, and indeed encouraged.

It is said that scepticism and nothing else justifies toleration; and Charles James Fox expressed the opinion: "The only foundation for toleration is a degree of scepticism, and without it there can be none." But this view has only an aspect of truth. We may hold our opinions earnestly and tenaciously, and allow others to hold theirs, and yet do so with sufficient humility to believe that still higher manifestations of truth will appear beyond that portion of it we ourselves believe we have found.

Our guiding principle may still be the sage advice given by Gamaliel to those who proposed to persecute St Peter: "If the movement is of this world, it will perish; if of God, ye cannot fight against God."

2. *We are by no means to cease argument in support of our own opinions.* We may endeavour to make as many converts to our beliefs as possible. We may be diligent in the defence and propagation of our opinions. Consistency and logic alike demand that a man shall be wholly something. A "die-hard" in anything is usually at least a consistent person, and you know where he stands every time. Someone has said: "What I hold to be the truth that I will assert to be the truth in the teeth of the devil and all his angels." The right

to think and the right of conscience have not suffered from intolerance, but the rights of speech and action have.

Mr Birrell wrote: "To allow yourself to be henpecked was, in Milton's opinion, a high crime and misdemeanour against humanity, and one which rendered a man infamous, and disqualified him from taking part in debate." So as regards one who differs from us, John Stuart Mill advises: "There are good reasons for remonstrating with him, or reasoning with him, or persuading him, or entreating him, but not for compelling him, or visiting him with any evil in case he do otherwise."

Dr Alexander Smellie wrote: "Persecution is indefensible and shameful. It is both a blunder and a sin. But men should be fully persuaded in their own minds, and ready to give a sufficient reason for the faith which is in them. There is a poor and pitiful tolerance as well as a tolerance which is magnanimous and godlike, a pseudo-charity which is not careful to search out the truth, that it may rejoice in it; a shallowness and a cowardice which are destitute of convictions of any sort, and too nerveless to say 'Stand thou on that side, for on this am I.'"

Let us hear also Thomas Carlyle's words of wisdom: "Tolerance has to tolerate the *un*essential, and to see well what that is. Tolerance has to be noble, measured, just in its very wrath, when it can tolerate no longer. But on the whole we are not altogether here to tolerate! We are here

to resist, to control, and vanquish withal. We do not 'tolerate' falsehoods, thieveries, iniquities, when they fasten on us. We say to them, 'Thou art false, thou art not tolerable!' We are here to extinguish falsehoods and put an end to them in some wise way! I will not quarrel so much with the way, the doing of the thing is our great concern."

3. *We must be logical in our opinions and beliefs, and ought not to pick and choose at random.* A man with a disorderly mind once said: "I cannot understand how you who are a supporter of Church Union are not also a Unionist in politics!" He, of course, was comparing terms which had quite different implications, and was to be suspected of being out to try and make a convert to his party, to achieve which he no doubt thought any argument good enough, as the end would justify the means!

In order to be logical in our beliefs we should settle in our minds certain general principles by which we mean to be guided. A coherent plan for thought and action means everything. Whether it be a conservative or progressive outlook, let it not be a passing prejudice or a generous gesture, but woven into the whole texture of the mind. Thus we achieve consistency and steadiness, which are the materials out of which reasonable toleration for others is formed. We can then appreciate the wisdom of the reasons for toleration of John Stuart Mill, which may be thus summarized:

1. The opinion silenced may after all be true.
2. It may be partly true and partly false, and so we should lose part of the truth by silencing opinion.
3. Unless an opinion, even if true, be vigorously and earnestly contested, it will be held as a mere prejudice, and its meaning perhaps be altogether lost.

As culture and enlightenment advance, and the scales of error fall from our eyes, we become tolerant of good and intolerant of evil things in the national life. For example, we no longer tolerate witch-trials and witch-burnings, which were of frequent occurrence a few hundred years ago; we do not tolerate the labour of children in factories or as chimney-sweeps, or the imprisonment of debtors, or insanitary gaols. On the other hand, we show tolerance towards all religious beliefs or political opinions so long as these are not subversive of public order or inimical to the welfare of the State. We now take the view that differences among Christians are of only secondary importance, and that good morals and good citizenship are not the monopoly of any religious sect or political faction.

Progressive thought, however, points to all kinds of reforms in every department of life, and upon these we are called upon to make up our minds. Our reformers say that there are anomalies and injustices which ought not to be tolerated—for example, inequalities in citizenship to which

women are subjected; the existence of State churches; capital punishment; control of the drink traffic, and a thousand and one more.

Let us, however, consider two questions that are of more than domestic urgency which will show how difficult are the questions which may arise in connection with toleration.

What degree of toleration are the British people to mete out to their fellow-subjects of the Crown who are of different race, colour, religion and culture? The question may ultimately be—although not, perhaps, in our day—what degree of toleration will *they* give to the British people? In Britain itself, at our universities and schools, in our commerce and industry, are to be found men and women from the British dominions beyond the seas of different race and colour. They have all the privileges of the British, and we meet them in our streets, on our railways, in our places of entertainment and in our houses. They are among us, though not of us. Except in a limited number of cases, we do not consort with them intimately; intermarriage is comparatively rare, and we maintain our reserve. But we certainly tolerate them, and we go much further than toleration.

But in the British colonies and dependencies the position is very different, and the race separation is strictly maintained. On street pavements and in public conveyances there is not even toleration by the British towards the natives.

Toleration

Let us look at some figures in order to keep well in view the stupendous problem which we are discussing.

The habitable land surface of the world comprises	53,000,000	sq. miles
Under *white* dominance, say nine-tenths (the greater part English-speaking) .	47,000,000	,,
Under *coloured* dominance (of which China and Japan (yellow races) dominate 4,000,000 sq. miles) .	6,000,000	,,
The British Empire contains . .	444,000,000	persons
Of whom the *white* population number .	65,000,000	,,
And the *coloured* people number .	379,000,000	,,
(Of whom India contains 320,000,000 and other Asiatics 20,000,000)		
World population . . .	1,650,000,000	,,
British Empire:		
White . . 65,000,000		
Coloured . 379,000,000		
444,000,000		
China . . 319,000,000		
Russia . . 132,000,000		
U.S.A. . . 118,000,000		
Japan . . 77,000,000		
Germany . . 60,000,000		
Netherlands . 56,000,000		
France . . 53,000,000		
Italy . . 40,000,000		
Other countries . 351,000,000		
	1,650,000,000	,,

There is a world problem of the future—viz. the relationship of the white and the coloured races

of the globe, which shall dominate the other, or whether they shall contrive to live in peaceful co-operation and mutual toleration.

Tremendous issues, both for the world and for the British Empire, opened up as the result of the Great War, which in the eyes of the coloured races was a Great *White* Civil War. The moral superiority of the white races over the coloured was shaken to its foundation by the cataclysm of the War, in which most of the white races were seen to resort to the most pagan and barbarous methods in their international disputes. War is war; the same in elemental fury and primitive passion whether carried on in Europe, China or the islands of the Pacific, and irrespective of the colour of the combatants.

Quick on the heels of the War have arisen questions of national self-determination and race-consciousness — not only in foreign lands like China and Egypt, but within the British Empire itself, as in India. Shall the native races, with lower economic standards, different customs, religion and outlook upon life, be permitted by their British rulers to govern themselves according to their own wishes and ideas?—and, if so, after what lapse of time, and by what processes of evolution? In other words, what are to be the degree and the methods of toleration to be applied in these colossal problems? The Simon Commission has investigated this very problem in India. But racial and national divisions are not identical,

and thus the problems are made more complicated. Clearly, there must be for the future either co-operation or a bloody struggle for domination. It is surely unthinkable that the British people, with their genius for colonization, will be unable to take the path of co-operation, granting political and economic freedom to coloured races or nationalities within the Empire gradually but surely. Even coloured men and women will not remain for ever among the unlearned and the unskilled, and Britain must take the long view, using imagination, tact and generosity, eliminating greed and exploitation and racial antagonisms, and giving always the helping hand. Repression, coercion and exclusion would lead only along the broad road to destruction and despair. Let us choose the narrow though difficult way This may not involve the intimacy of intermarriage or social equality on this side of long ages of time, but these are not involved in questions of self-determination or self-government of a race or a nation. Already there has been much co-operation in war, in commerce, in industry, in sport, in religion and other spheres, and we must make sure that all doors open easily down the corridors of Time in the house of Humankind, which assuredly will not be made with hands alone.

Let us consider next the subject of war, which most nations agree is intolerable, but which few nations have yet definitely decided no longer to tolerate. The farther the nations involved in the

Great War recede from it, the better ought they to be able to take a detached view of its results and effects; but, on the other hand, the less vividly does its frightfulness appeal to them. New generations are arising which know not the awfulness of war, and which may, therefore, be readier to plunge into it in future, all unknowing of the calamities it involves. The nations which suffered most in the Great War will for many decades feel impoverishment, and physical and material loss. They have also had good cause to appreciate the moral degradation and the industrial and economic unsettlement caused by the War, of which the end is not yet. Apart from the millions who died in the War, and the millions who through casualties are now hirpling through the remainder of their days, there are left the untold millions of mentally weakened men and women, broken hearts, ruined hopes, shattered lives and desolate homes. In most minds the War has left at least a shudder and a nightmare for memory. Of sacrifice almost divine, of heroism almost godlike, of endurance more than Promethean, there was an outpouring such as the world had never before known. That the War was finally inevitable is clear; and that it saved the world from an intolerable threat of servitude, and achieved national liberty, history will record. That it enabled certain of the smaller nations to preserve their national existence, and others to regain theirs, is also matter of history.

But against whatever good there was in it

there has to be set a terrible reckoning. Certain momentous issues were settled, but many new issues were raised. It is impossible to estimate how far the War was the direct or indirect cause of the Revolution in Russia, the Fascist despotism in Italy, and other national upheavals. There are few countries of the world which have not had domestic catastrophes, economic crises, industrial struggles, and other distractions, all more or less directly or indirectly arising out of the War. A set-back has been given to the progress of every form of culture and refinement, and much of what the world possessed was lost. Materialism, with its myriad attendants, ruled the minds of men and nations during and after the War, and iron entered and held the souls of the people.

War as a means of settling international disputes is utterly discredited among all rational people. To blast the souls out of millions of men does not really achieve justice. If justice has been outraged, the conquered nation will simply bide its time until it is strong enough to make another attempt to secure its rights. War has been well termed "a damnable arrest of development and decency." There are, however, many vested interests which benefit by war, and the preparations for war. There are the manufacturers of armaments, and traders in them, and all the numerous interests which make profits out of preparations for war and war itself. The influence used by all such interests is very extensive, and tends to shape

national policy. They propagate the heresy that to secure peace it is necessary to prepare for war, and that the greater the armaments the more secure a nation is. They have no place in their minds for the authority and security which may be obtained by the use of reason, fair inquiry, and judgment in arbitration, backed by enlightened public opinion. Their only weapon is force. They refuse to look, for example, at the long frontier line between Canada and the United States of America, which is without a fort or a soldier, and is guarded only by the restraints of public morality and mutual respect.

There seem to be only two ways in which these sinister influences can be countered. One is by keeping before the citizens of the State the unmitigated horror of war, and its bestiality and bloodiness. It is necessary to remind them of women and children and other non-belligerents murdered, passenger and hospital ships sunk, the diabolism of poison gas, and every kind of pagan and hellish outrage committed in war. They must be warned of the diabolical inventions of science since the War, which would involve in any future war on a large scale the extinction of civilization itself. They must be reminded of the utter abandonment in war of every instinct of mercy, pity and sympathy, when a nation becomes, in its concentrated mind and strength, obsessed with the destruction of its fellow-men who are for the time being "the enemy." The other way is by

elevating the League of Nations into a potent authority and instrument for the prevention of war and for the settlement of international disputes by arbitration.

Man is ever on the search for truth. To seek truth implies the right of private judgment and the critical faculty. The search for truth implies a frame of mind in which men acknowledge their own fallibility, and desire above everything to ascertain what is true according to the dictates of reason. It is the opposite to the spirit of dogmatism.

We underestimate the permanence and indestructibility of Truth. We think we have discovered Truth in its entirety, and fearful lest we lose it, or lest it suffer hurt, we set out to compel all men to adopt and admit it, under pains and penalties. "Truth" (wrote Milton, in his *Areopagitica*) "is strong next to the Almighty. She needs no policies or stratagems or licensings to make her victorious. These are the shifts and the defences that Error uses against her power." We are all oblivious of the fact that we have but caught a fleeting glimpse of the fringe of Truth's mantle, and that our eyesight is not good at the best. Truth is not like a flickering flame to be sheltered from the wind; nor is it like a hothouse plant which will perish if the temperature falls. In a burst of rhetoric it may be likened to a pearl, but what we hail as the Pearl of Truth is at best only one gem in a crown whose brilliance is too

dazzling for the eyes of mind and soul to look upon.

To realize this is the beginning of knowledge, and then we may follow on to know more. Visions of Truth may break on the mind of a man like the Dawn. He will proclaim it, and live for it, and may have to die for it. The vision will hold, but it will change. Others who look through this man's eyes and see his vision will also see more than he, and so the Truth which they proclaim to their generation may be different from his, and yet the same. At the best, the visions are but "broken arcs." The lights of Eternal Truth only glimmer throughout the ages, and are shifting and mingled in the sight of men. "Truth is eternal, but her effluence, with endless change, is fitted to the hour."

So one man looks at another; one nation studies the lore of another; one generation compares the wisdom of another; and out of that grows the spirit of toleration. "There is, then, something more?" we say. Was ours or theirs only a fragment after all? Were these right only so far as they went? Did the persecuted stand for something worthy? Was there even a little gold amongst the alloy of the persecutors? Is it possible that those from whom we differ to-day hold something of value too? At least let us determine not to kill them, or persecute, or penalize, or degrade, or outlaw them. The light that is in us may be comparative darkness after all.

Toleration

When seeing men have urged toleration, the coercionists and persecutors have always pointed to the disasters which would ensue if toleration were granted, and too often they have had their way. Panic has often overcome the truer instincts of men. But where toleration has been granted has it been ruin and the end of all things? Did the threatened calamities happen? Did the emancipated turn and rend their deliverers? On the contrary, there often has followed sweet reasonableness, a libation of gratitude which by its spirit healed the soreness of strife, broke down barriers, and found common ground. "The foundations of morality have not been weakened," says a writer; "the practice of it has not ceased; respect for the law has not diminished; society is not on the brink of dissolution." At least the State and industry have not suffered, but benefited, by every instalment of toleration. In the end it will be found that Truth has not suffered either. Some exclusive organizations may have suffered in membership or influence; there may be more unorthodox thinkers groping for more light; there may be apparent instability in belief. But Truth still sits enthroned with the Crown upon its head.

Our fears for Truth are groundless, and what we need is more faith in it. We are no doubt the guardians and custodians of the part of Truth we hold, which we must defend with every ounce of persuasion and argument we possess. If we fail, the final revelation of Truth may be post-

poned, and its progress thwarted, but the triumph of Truth is eternally sure. "Truth will not be for ever on the scaffold; Wrong will not be for ever on the throne." Truth entrusts us now with what we hold; generations yet unborn will hold more than we, and they await to receive from us our visions untarnished. But Truth is of the Infinite, and our finite minds would do well to reach out to and proclaim the best of Truth that we can know, and in reverent faith in its triumph quietly possess our souls.

III

Compromise

In human society people have to learn the art of living with one another. It involves mutual accommodation and the surrender of doing only what one likes. The recluse and ascetic who, in ancient times, retired to the wilds, where alone he could get uninterrupted opportunity for meditation, needed not to study the art of adjusting himself to the convenience of others. His modern imitators who endeavour to withdraw themselves from life's responsibilities and, as they put it, "live their own life," can usually be traced by at least the gas collector or the inspector of taxes. Even bachelors in rooms have to accommodate themselves to their landladies, and find them sometimes more exacting to accommodate than a wife would have been—and serve them right too!

We have all to suit ourselves to the general organization of society, and to the particular individuals among whom we live and work who compose our small world. We simply cannot have our own way. But we have to reckon with the fact that the men and women of our world are all different. Diversity of character and interest is everywhere. There are all kinds of virtue and vice, wisdom and

foolishness. We encounter bland and phlegmatic people; the irritable and the explosive; the deadly dull and the vivacious; and people with sharp edges to their temperament and unrounded corners in their manners. When our own disposition happens to conflict with any of these varieties, then, for the sake of domestic peace, or for the sake of our livelihood—if not for the hope of salvation and the love of God—let there be mutual accommodation! The want of it may lead us to the criminal dock, the Divorce Court, or the workhouse, so that the sooner we get "broken in" the better. We all pass through a stage of life when we chafe against the novelty of life's harness and the first feeling of a "social" weight upon our backs. Our training, however, usually continues as long as life, and some of us show vagaries of ill-training even when the journey is far on. We shy at this, and bolt at that, to the concern, annoyance and danger of our companions in life's harness. In this matter we are in a sad case if we have never grown up.

The problem of life is not only how to live, but how to live together. It is necessary always to stand up for what we believe to be the truth, and to speak out unfalteringly takes effort and courage. But while the truth must be spoken firmly it can be declared more quietly and inoffensively than is often done. We dislike the person who "truths it in love" to us, as we suspect the love of covering his secret satisfaction in opposing us. There would be fewer occasions for compromise if, however, we

spoke less and thought more. We should prune our words and cultivate more reticence. Many a time the inanities we speak give needless offence, and a thoughtless word may send someone in off the deep end. We should be non-conductors of heat or scandal, and thus help to make life sweeter and our relations with our fellows easier.

The definition of compromise given in a respectable dictionary is: "An amicable agreement between parties in controversy to settle their differences by mutual concessions." The definition is really too limited, for you do not need to be in controversy to call in the aid of compromise. To be alive in human society is enough. The problem is how to adjust oneself to other people in the legislative, municipal or local councils, administrative bodies, committees of all kinds, commerce and business; in the same house, at the same bench, in the same office, at meals, or at recreation—during all the waking moments of our lives. Every phase of character is brought into play, and love, wisdom, knowledge, patience, humour, and a hundred virtues more, are all needed to make the adjustment possible, not to say congenial. In a single word, "temper" is what counts in this adjustment—temper, good or bad, easy or sharp, kind or rough, Christ-like or devilish.

The definition speaks of controversy, but this is what many people eschew, more than they abhor evil. Disraeli, at the age of twenty, wrote in his diary: "Never argue; in society nothing must be

discussed; give only results. If any person differ from you, bow, and turn the conversation." Some people hate disputes, arguments or quarrels like poison. A friend of mine even declines to go to church because he is apt to get his conscience pricked there, which, he says, is uncomfortable. What he hears there (and this may be a testimony to the efficiency of the pulpit) sets up uneasy arguments in his mind, and he objects to that. This type of person loves the even tenor of his way, his ease and his easy-chair, the broad beaten paths and calm seas. He simply cannot understand a sentiment like Jackie (Lord) Fisher's, that "Risks and strife are the bread of life." He loathes publicity, or having attention called to him. He is in constant dread lest he stir up a wasp's nest somewhere. He will conform to anything so long as he is left in peace. He will go with the crowd every time rather than take a road of his own. He, in short, takes good care to hold no opinions or beliefs which are calculated to bring him into conflict with his fellows, and any beliefs he has are so fluid as to be incapable of compromise. He is a dilettante.

In *Who's Who*, among other more or less interesting or irrelevant details about people, it is customary to state their "recreations," and those of a recent Secretary of State are given as "normal forms of loafing and dilettanteism."

Now a dilettante is defined as "one who loves the fine arts, but in a superficial way and without

serious purpose." Probably the word has now obtained a more general significance, and is applied to anyone who loves anything (or anybody, for that matter) in a superficial way, and without serious purpose. The term might indeed be applied to any modern Don Juan, and might be used as a term of scorn by a matter-of-fact or irate mother of a family to any gentleman visitor whose serious matrimonial intentions are open to suspicion.

The term takes high rank, however, in our literature through its use by Thomas Carlyle. In his "vitriolic" way he speaks of his dilettante friend with a "placid dilettante simper"; of the dilettanti who "go gracefully idle in Mayfair." He says the Gospel of Dilettanteism is still mournfuller than that of Mammonism; "Mammonism . . . at least *works*, this goes idle." Again he speaks of "the respectablest ghastly, dead or galvanized Dilettanteism." "Alas!" he says, "if Hero worship become Dilettanteism, and all except Mammonism be a vain grimace!" and he deplores "an unserious Dilettanteism, earnest about nothing, grinning with inarticulate, incredulous, incredible jargon about all things, as the *enchanted* dilettanti do by the Dead Sea!"

There is simply no mistaking the type, and not alone in Mayfair are they to be found. Dilettanteism is admirable in recreation; it is ruinous in life's work.

The dilettante is a mere dabbler in life, taking nothing very seriously or for very long. You will

find him invariably at the outside of a crowd, not in the ring taking sides. He is rather superior, and as he suffers from ennui he does not try to hide that he is bored. He never stakes anything, and in life's gamble he never stakes himself, which is the only stake worth throwing. He takes no risks. He looks on amused, and belittles those whom he sees taking life seriously. When he sees them get hurt (as those must, who fight for principle) he thinks it serves them right. Of course, he becomes cynical. If he does take a hand himself he is self-conscious, and is always thinking about those who may see or hear him. He is over-sensitive to outside opinion, and has always a shelter behind him into which he may run, or a shell into which he may curl up. Naturally he is very superficial in anything he essays.

William James, the pragmatist philosopher, has (as one might expect) his critical eye on the dilettante. He says: "The deepest difference practically, in the moral life of man, is the difference between the easy-going and the strenuous mood. . . . The capacity for the strenuous mood probably lies slumbering in every man, but it has more difficulty in some than in others in waking up. It needs the wilder passions to arouse it, the big fears, loves, and indignations; or else the deeply penetrating appeal of some one of the higher fidelities, like justice, truth, or freedom."

James has obvious contempt for the "don't-care mood," and he has the final word of approbation for

responding to the challenging appeal, and "living hard and getting out of the game of existence its keenest possibilities of zest"; and he says that "the strenuous type of character will on the battle-field of human history always outwear the easy-going type." James, in short, means that the man who loses his life shall find it.

It is all essential to realize the value of individual opinion. The interesting object in human life is not the type or the group, but—the person. This is a truth which is liable to be lost sight of, in an age of democracy, militarism, bureaucracy, unions, trusts, combines, division of labour, factory "hands" and economic "facts." A man is a man, and a woman is a woman; not a "hand" or a "number," and still less a cipher. A man or a woman means a brain and a soul, the most priceless possessions that earth holds. The individual man and woman must be kept elevated in the esteem of the world. We must save life, because we may thus save heroes to worship. We must at all costs give human life room to breathe, lest we lose a single genius.

The really important thing about the individual is what he or she thinks. Speech and action are only the outward manifestations of thought. Thoughts constitute the life behind the scenes. In the heart and mind of every individual there is a secret busy life which even the X-ray cannot photograph. Suggestion, emotion, will, imagination, are acting there incidents the most dramatic and enthralling, of which the outer world knows

nothing. There is a constant traffic of impressions being conveyed inwards to supply and stimulate the drama in the theatre of the soul, and through brain, eye and ear there are being hurried into the anterooms of the mind all the items of knowledge, experience and pictures of life we are collecting every conscious moment of our lives. It is well for the individual if he is more than a spectator of the drama. It is there that quietly, perhaps unconsciously, our opinions are formed. It is "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh."

It is our business to see that the opinions we form in that silent lonely place are well-informed and accurate, and the result of our own reason and judgment. Every man has the inalienable right and privilege of private judgment, and for that judgment he will one day have to give account. The right cannot be surrendered; it cannot be bartered; it cannot be impledged. Specious offers are daily made to us by our newspapers and magazines, by our societies and unions, by the world in which we move, and by our political and municipal candidates, that they will take care of our opinions for us, and that our own judgments and opinions are of little consequence. It is only the world's fools who accept these offers, and the wise insist on forming their own opinions. It is our duty to seek for truth and to utter it. "Get but the Truth once uttered, and it is like a Star newborn, that drops into its place."

Some people are, however, not wise in this matter. They are ready to absorb any and every impression, and the last impression they happen to receive may decide them how to act or vote. They are not too particular as to the source of the impressions, and may take them from a newspaper or a casual acquaintance in the street. Nor are they squeamish as to the quality of the impressions, which may be prejudice, gossip or scandal. They have minds like feather-beds.

It has been said, "An Englishman's creed is compromise"; and it is true also of many Scotsmen. The *via media* has a tremendous fascination for some people who are anxious to appear broad-minded. They are expert at the game known as "exploring avenues," as if every set of opinions was accommodated in a mansion approached by carriage drives, paths to the conservatories, the garage, the servants' quarters, and the kitchen-garden. Thought and belief which may startle the world live in humbler abodes, perhaps in a peasant's cottage at Eisleben, where Martin Luther was born, or in a house in Canongate, where Knox lived. "A miner's son converted Germany to the Reformation. The London artisans and the peasants of Buckinghamshire went to the stake for doctrines which were accepted afterwards as a second revelation."

The *via media* is not an Appian Way. You will see those men and women sunning themselves upon it who are opportunists and want to stand

well with all parties, but who usually have the confidence of none. There are inert masses of "sleepy conformity" in the world which are the despair of alert reformers who strive to get things done.

"The *via media*" (says Augustine Birrell, in his *Obiter Dicta*), alluring as is its direction, imposing as are its portals, is, after all, only what Londoners call a blind alley, leading nowhere."

The Whigs used to be twitted on having a "Cross-bench" mind—that is to say, too accommodating for Radical reform, but not rigid enough to ensure the confidence of Conservatives.

Having appreciated the value of the individual, of individual opinion and private judgment, and of the absolute necessity of mutual accommodation and adjustment in a thickly populated and highly complex society such as ours, it is necessary now to consider to what extent we are to allow compromise to operate in our lives.

There is a wide field for compromise on unessentials. For example, a husband is well advised to defer to his wife's opinions and wishes on most things. She probably knows far better than he in any case. There must, of course, be "give and take," and the proportions of giving and taking should be fairly adhered to. Some people of both sexes would like to take all, and give none; which is obviously unfair.

We may also compromise freely in matters of dress—on the question of a silk hat, for example,

which is now reserved mostly for marriages and funerals. Some people, however, in the last ditch in the struggle against fashion, still cling to the custom of wearing it to church and at other times, regarding it as one of the few remaining tokens of respectability. Disraeli was an outstanding example in refusing to compromise on matters of dress, for his biographer tells us that he as a young dandy used to affect "a coat of black velvet, poppy-coloured trousers, broidered with gold, a scarlet waistcoat, sparkling rings worn on top of white kid gloves." We may err on the side of uninteresting uniformity in dress to the loss of individuality, but it is a fit subject for compromise.

Ladies' skirts and shingled hair are themselves a compromise nowadays decreed by the Queen of Fashion, but even these fashions need not cause another general strike.

To a pipe-smoker a cigarette is a compromise. There are, however, certain domestic and public regulations as to where a man shall smoke at all, on which, of course, we may without compunction compromise our own views.

It is also unwise to force our own wishes, for example, if we attempt to go in the opposite direction to a crowd—say at a football match or on a theatre stair. We are then well advised to compromise.

On the other hand, in some of the less serious departments of life we set our faces like flint

against compromise. *Punch*, for example, will never compromise on the subject of the saxophone; nor will *Blackwood's Magazine* on the subject of the Bolsheviks or the Die-hards. In sport of all kinds there ought to be no compromise, each player playing to win, without thought of compromise. Any man or woman who feels disposed to offer a compromise in a golf match ought to consult a doctor.

In the matter of training of young children, it is at their peril if parents compromise with them. Children seem to be most knowing and watchful for the least sign of compromise, and will scan their guardian's face for a flicker of a smile, or the least sign of relenting. He or she who then compromises is lost! It is often a battle of wills, and it is obviously in the interests of the child and of the home that the child's will should give way in matters of discipline and conduct.

Parents, however, are very apt to forget that their children grow up. Some parents never realize the fact that their children, in young manhood and womanhood, begin to develop their own powers, faculties and instincts, and that their own ideals begin to take shape. Some parents make the profound mistake of treating them with uncompromising rigour, as if they were still five years old. Their children have to live their own lives, and in totally different environment and circumstances from that of their parents' youth, for the world has moved on since then. That is the time

for wise guidance, and a gradual relaxing of the grip and a gradual slackening of the rein, according as this can safely be done in the interests of the children. Parents then will have to compromise on many a point, forbearing to impose their wills, opinions and beliefs on their children, but teaching them rather to think and believe for themselves. Happy are the parents and children between whom, besides the bonds of affection, there is also an understanding sense of humour. It will round many an awkward corner and dissolve many a troublesome difficulty.

From the point of view of the children themselves, it is to be observed that they are less given to compromise. This often makes matters more difficult, but on the whole it is less to be regretted than admired. They may not have life's experience; their opinions may be crude and ill-instructed; and it is a mistake to expect of them the wisdom of the sages or the goodness of the saints. But they have possessions which are invaluable, in their glowing enthusiasms, their lofty ideals, their unstained lives and their warm affections, which seldom brook compromise.

We would all do well to cultivate courtesy—old-fashioned though the virtue be. It frequently involves our compromising on our legitimate, harmless and even modest rights and privileges. In spite of the just recognition of women as men's equal in every respect, it will be an evil day when men lose their sense of chivalry towards women.

There we may compromise freely on unessentials, and be the better and more self-respecting men for doing it.

There is one type of person who always refuses compromise under any circumstances and on any subject. At meetings we are accustomed to hear him, as a matter of course, say, "I object," no matter what the proposal may be. It has probably become a habit with him, betokening a bent of mind which is contradictory and opinionative. His hand is against every man's, and you might as well ask him to die as to compromise. He is the despair of all reasonable people, and usually becomes a nuisance. His objections are regarded as unreasonable and contumacious. He himself becomes objectionable, and his views soon cease to command any respect. He fails, because he has not learned when to compromise.

If one must decline to compromise, it should be evident that sound reasons exist for declining. Blind, unreasoning obdurateness achieves little, and a man should be prepared to declare the truth that is in him when he declines to compromise.

On matters of personal conduct and morality we must at all costs decide to take the right course and stick to it, refusing to compromise. Whatever views there may be about the existence of a personal devil, the insidious temptations to evil in the human heart need no proof, because everyone knows them, though not all will admit their activity. The spirit of evil is a past master in the art of

compromise. The suggestion of half-truths, of "peradventures" and of seductive benefits are the preliminaries to unworthy compromises. These temptations from the path of rectitude must be withstood, though the very heavens fall.

We must never lower our ideals beneath the highest that we can conceive. There is a constant danger of contenting ourselves with the second-best. We should delete from our vocabulary the word "impossible" until we are irretrievably "down and out"—and not even then, because we may rise again. "Who aimeth at the sky shoots higher far than he who means a tree." We should therefore aim at the highest standards of conduct or effort, and of purpose, whether in our daily work or hobbies, in music, art or letters. The victory is often in the striving.

Deeper than all lie the dangers of compromise in the realm of the imagination, the picture gallery of the soul. If the visions we see there, and the images formed there, are pure and uplifting, then they will be mirrored in our speech and action. It is impossible to avoid unworthy suggestions and impure impressions coming to our imaginations, but what is possible is whether we compromise with them or not. If we summarily eject them, without parley or condition, our moral strength not only remains intact, but is increased by the promptness and decision we show. To change the metaphor: our imagination at first is like a ploughed untrodden field, in which the furrows run even and

unmarked; when some impure suggestion is admitted it treads across the virgin soil, and the line of a path is made; it soon gets trodden into a hardened track, easy to traverse, as the suggestion comes again and again, bringing with it others of its kind. Good seed falling there will soon be picked up. It is thus that the unblushing, hardened heart is made, on which the impact of goodness fails to make impression.

On the question of personal religion, again we must not compromise, because the issues are too serious. We must seek for truth as blind men seek for light, and no make-believe or quibbling can be tolerated in that adventure. Historical facts we must have, and evidences to satisfy our reason, but we must beware of excluding facts of experience and the testimony of our emotions and imaginations, and indeed avoid blocking any window of the soul through which the light of truth may shine.

The whole Protestant movement is a revolt against the compromise of an intermediary priesthood between God and man. Protestants protest that there is no half-way house for the forgiveness of sins which is by God alone. They protest against indulgences or dispensations sold at so much a gross, or buying by money currency either a soul's absolution or a short and easy passage through a spiritual purgatory.

The Christian churches often come in for severe criticism, but seldom has there been a sterner

indictment than that of the Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard (formerly vicar of St Martin's-in-the-Fields) in his book, *The Impatience of a Parson.* He maintains that the churches have made compromise of the religion and spirit of Christ. He says: "The churches have corporately so misunderstood the message of their Founder, and so mishandled and mislaid His values—the values of his Father—God—that what survives and does duty nowadays, through the churches, as Christianity, is a caricature of what Christ intended. . . .

"The most thoughtful men to-day have long ceased to expect redress for the world's distractions from the Christian churches. . . .

"It is difficult to believe that Our Lord ever had any desire to authorize a hierarchy of men to define and curtail the boundaries of His religion."

It is unnecessary to discuss here to what extent this indictment is warranted by the facts, but it is at least a matter for grave and earnest inquiry.

On the vexed question of Church Union in this Protestant land of Britain, where so many sects compose the Church, Dr Orchard of London says: "Christian reconciliation does not mean . . . an ingenious compromise; it is something that has to be secured by sacrifice, and the sacrifice has to be first set forth by the superior party and then followed by others." Let those who sit at the conference tables on Union ponder well what this opinion involves.

In the ecclesiastical world the English Revised

Prayer Book of 1927 is a historic example of a compromise that failed. The Primate of England had spent many years of his life in the atmosphere of compromise and in the work of compromise, his whole mental attitude being adjusted to the focus of compromise. In the necessary revision of the Prayer Book, after an interval of several hundred years, he had attempted to reconcile Anglo-Catholic Romanism with Evangelical Protestantism in doctrine, church service and discipline. By the vote of the House of Commons his compromise failed. The majority of the House apparently believed that the compromise was an attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable. The gulf of separation proved too wide and deep for the bridge of compromise.

The Scottish Temperance Act of 1913 was an outstanding example of compromise between the drink interests and temperance reform. The reformers secured the principle and application of Local Option to Scotland, but they made concessions in regard to the period when the Act should come into operation.

Nowhere is compromise more apparent than in politics, and in certain aspects nowhere is it more necessary. For example, it may be found by legislators to be impossible to carry a certain measure, and they may deem it advisable to accept a compromise and achieve part of what is aimed at. That is the policy of the "half-loaf." But there are aspects of politics in which compromise should

have no place. There are too many politicians of the dilettante type, devoid of principle of any kind, and ready to compromise principle for profit. They are the opportunists and the weathercocks of politics, turning now here and now there with every change in the airt of the wind. Deep convictions, for which they will endure sacrifice, they have none: to them politics is merely a game, the sport of an hour, without high purpose or meaning, the amusement, if not the scorn, of the sceptic. To the politician whose currency is compromise, the House of Commons is simply a stage on which the members are but actors playing a part, the home of unrealities, formulas and shams. Knaves and rogues, tricksters and adventurers there no doubt have been in politics, and will be again, but in politics, as in religion or any other sphere, it is possible to find men and women of high ideals and conviction, who will not stoop to compromise their principles, whatever be the cost. Now and again such persons stand out from the crowd, by resigning position and power rather than compromise their conscientious scruples. They rightly deserve our admiration.

Mr Lecky says that "a disinterested love of Truth can hardly co-exist with a strong political spirit." There is an element of right in this, for it is too true that expediency is often made the test of truth, and utilitarianism becomes the mental perspective. It is said that every man has his price: it all depends on the size of the bribe.

One would grieve to think that these sentiments represent the average man or woman, although sad experience shows that they are true of many. That it is necessary for anyone engaged in politics to abjure the love and practice of truth we deny with all the earnestness at our command. The contrary is affirmed usually by those who have failed to hold to their ideals, or who have never stepped into the road of politics and done their best to keep it clean. If men like Wilberforce, Shaftesbury, Gladstone, Campbell-Bannerman or Asquith have trod the road and swept it, and still kept their garments clean, other men and women may do the same.

We are now ready to consider some simple rules for guidance when compromise is necessary and right. That such compromises come into everyday life is quite proper, and indeed essential if life's activities are not to be brought to a standstill.

1. The compromises we make should not be hasty. We are all familiar with the kind of com promise which is so often hurried through at the end of long discussions. All the pros and cons have been debated without sign of yielding, and matters have come to an impasse. Some members show signs of impatience, or a desire to leave, and the chairman, feeling that something must be done, sets about drawing up a formula which he hopes may meet the views of all parties. He, in fact, attempts a compromise, which is usually a "cocktail" compromise, containing a little of the opinions

of each of the warring parties. He is himself probably far from cool; the atmosphere is vitiated, and the hour late, when he announces his formula. It may be that some formulæ on such occasions may be almost inspired in their efficiency to reconcile varying opinions, and they sometimes merit the success they achieve. But on other occasions one party, by agreeing to a formula, may find that they have given themselves away.

Therefore the compromises we make should be arrived at after the fullest inquiry and the most mature deliberation. We must weigh carefully conflicting proposals, and discover and recognize the essentials. Our estimate of values is all important, and our ultimate aim must be constantly before our eyes.

2. We must not believe, "at one and the same moment of time, self-contradictory propositions."

Belief is essential to action, and, if we are to do anything at all, we must make up our minds, and, like Mr Britling, "see it through." The rub is to make up our minds consistently and with logical accuracy. All sorts of emotions, ideas and influences come into play in the process, especially if we keep our minds in compartments—our mental kitchen and scullery for our business decisions, our mental dining-room for personal decisions, our mental drawing-room for social decisions, and our mental lumber-room for decisions on public or religious questions. On one question prejudice decides; on another, gossip; on another, appetite;

and so on, with no more coherence or method than is to be found on a table at a jumble sale. This is to have a disorderly mind, and the remedy is to be found in getting back to first principles and fundamentals, and rebuilding on these.

3. It is quite proper to accept a compromise as an instalment. If we cannot get the whole, it may be quite right to accept the half. We may live to secure the other half another time. We must, however, see what the acceptance of the half involves. It may be that, if we accept it, we shall be hindering instead of advancing a genuine reform. We may be side-tracked.

Mr John Morley (afterwards Viscount Morley) puts this with great force when he says, commenting on the French saying that small reforms are the worst enemies of great reforms: "There is a sense in which the saying is profoundly true. A small and temporary improvement may really be the worst enemy of a great and permanent improvement, unless the first is made on the lines and in the direction of the second. . . . The second possible evil of a small reform may be equally mischievous—where the small reform is represented as settling the question. . . . It sets men's minds in a posture of contentment which is not justified by the amount of what has been done, and which makes it all the harder to arouse to new effort when the inevitable time arrives."

In 1874 Mr Morley published a little book, entitled *Compromise*. From its pages it appears

that Morley considered that material prosperity and decline in sincerity of spiritual interest accounted for our slackness in forming opinions. He denounces the toleration of holding opinions which we know to be false, and says it is always wrong for the more enlightened people to allow the less enlightened to go on believing error. We must not play tricks with conscience, and we have nothing to do with whether our views are practicable or not, so long as they are true. Opinions shape ideals and ideals inspire conduct. As to realizing opinion, a man's attitude should be less inflexible. A whole community cannot be made at once to submit to new ideas, and perpetual compromise is necessary. But he distinguishes between legitimate and illegitimate compromise. We must not reject the highest truth, or dissemble our own acceptance of it. Persuasion and not force must be our weapon for realizing our opinions.

In view of the extent to which Morley in his book adopts the attitude of the sceptic and freethinker in regard to religion, we may be permitted to offer some comments on this point. Morley constantly attacks the dogma of the Church, and much of his criticism is no doubt fully merited. But Church dogma is not Christianity in its essence, and should not be mistaken for it. Nor is Christianity Church dogma; and Morley's criticism is not really criticism of Christianity. Christianity is an adventure in Christian living. It is Christianity

in life and action, and not in dogma, which is the material thing. The Church doctrine and organization must always be subsidiary to the adventure in Christian living, which may and does exist far and wide beyond the pale of any church.

Morley did not seem to be aware of, or to acknowledge, the debts he himself owed to Christianity, and even to traditional religion. For his own critical bent and faculty and the freedom to use them without fear or favour, for the catholicity and fairness of his own mind, for his own tolerance, for his own reverence and fine feelings, and many other qualities of mind and soul, Morley was debtor to the past triumphs of Christianity in history and to the spirit of Christianity more than he probably knew.

Morley would no doubt say that he quotes from the Bible only as "a noble and most majestic monument of literature," as he calls it. But how saturated was Morley's own mind with the Bible may be seen from his numerous allusions to passages in it, if not direct quotations, and his use of its terms and phrases. The following are examples:

"The souls of men have become void. Into the void have entered in triumph the seven devils of Secularity."

"We quote Saint Paul when he talked of making himself all things to all men, and of becoming to the Jews a Jew, and as without the Law to the heathen."

"We imitate the same apostle in accepting old time-worn altars dedicated to the Unknown God."

They "sell their intellectual birthright for a mess of pottage."

"They sought truth and ensued it."

"The future faith, like the faith of the past, brings not peace but a sword."

"Households divided against themselves."

"Make the old bottles hold the new wine."

"The Hebrew expressed in old phrase, that if counsel or work be of men it will come to nought, but if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it."

But the influence of the Bible and of Christ's teaching on Morley goes far deeper. It is apparent, but he does not acknowledge it. He uses the language and symbols of Scripture always with reverence, and never with a sneer. But his persistent search for Truth, his insistence on its value and its demands, his belief in its eternal permanence and its intrinsic value in human affairs, breathe the spirit of Christ who said to Pilate: "This is why I came into the world, to bear testimony to the Truth. Everyone who belongs to the Truth listens to my voice." Did not Morley listen to His voice?

Morley's hatred of shams and make-believes, of unworthy compromises, of craven shiftiness, of hoodwinking and time-serving, shows the inspiration of Christ who denounced hypocrites as "tombs whitewashed." "You serpents! You brood of

vipers! How can you escape being sentenced to Gehenna?"

Morley's unflinching courage in choosing the right and denouncing the wrong may have been born of the magnificent courage Christ showed in the face of the crowd of angry Scribes and Pharisees who brought to Him the woman taken in adultery: "Let the innocent among you throw the first stone at her," He said.

Morley does not acknowledge allegiance to Christ as his Master, but we do well to remember the Master's words: "It is not everyone who says to me, Lord, Lord, who will get into the realm of Heaven, but he that does the will of my Father in Heaven."

Can we doubt, in reading Morley's book on "Compromise," that in its spirit and teaching Morley was doing the Divine Will? He speaks as if under the compulsion that if he were to keep silent "the very stones would shout." Christ loved free-thinkers like Morley, just because they had minds and souls which were alive and on the alert, and He could thus influence them. Morley may have got the surprise of his spiritual life when he crossed over and heard the greeting, "Well done, good and faithful servant"; but that he got it, there need be no manner of doubt.

IV

John Morley on "Compromise"

JOHN MORLEY'S book entitled *Compromise* (published in 1874) contained a series of articles which had previously appeared in the *Fortnightly Review* (of which journal he was the editor). A second edition appeared some years later, and in a note prefixed to it by the author he explained that his book was nothing more than an essay, and was not to be judged as an exhaustive treatise in casuistry.

The book contains two hundred and sixty-five pages of compact reasoning, in Morley's classic English style. It is philosophical in treatment, and too "stiff" for popular taste—at least in these later days. The argument is ponderous, and the manner is reminiscent of the furniture of the period. Morley was thirty-six years of age when he wrote the book. There is not, therefore, in it the maturity of thought and ease of style of his later years. Mr F. W. Hirst says that "a caustic critic observed that except in the title he could find no trace of compromise in Morley's book."

But the book has been cherished by thinkers of Morley's own time and of subsequent generations. It is in many ways a gem of literature, and is full

of gems of thought. It is throughout a stimulant to thought whether one agrees with the writer or not.

Morley himself performed a service to John Stuart Mill's essay on "Liberty" (which he took "almost for a postulate") by adding to his book on "Compromise" eighteen pages of an explanatory "Note" on Mill's famous essay. Something of the kind is needed to make Morley's book more welcome to modern readers, and the book is worthy of it. Accordingly, it might not be amiss to attempt, with all humility, to make a digest of Morley's book, with a view to bringing into relief its scheme of treatment and its main arguments, adding little in the way of comment. Ours is an age which demands signposts at every turn of the road. Morley's book (like all thoughtful books worth reading) must be read pencil in hand. Assuming that the reader has sold some valued belonging and bought a copy of *Compromise* for his very own, the book must be marked and underlined, adding signposts and arrow-heads, many an exclamation mark of wonder and delight, and many a question mark. But if all that is faithfully done, one may rise from the book a new man, with a feeling of being better educated mentally, morally and spiritually.

i

There are forty-three pages of an "Introduction," which is at best a rather cold and distant bow in

the direction of Lady Compromise. All that Morley wrote is worth reading, including this "Introduction," but its perusal may be postponed until we have risen exultant from the glowing pages in the book itself on devotion to Truth.

From the "Introduction" we learn that we are to study *the limits of the art of Compromise—i.e.* the boundary lines between

Wise suspense in *forming* opinions Wise reserve in *expressing* them Wise tardiness in *trying to realize* them	and	self illusion. dissimulation. weakness.	These are the "three independent provinces of compromise."

But "the one commanding law is that men should *cling to truth and right*, if the very heavens fall."

Morley then discusses in criticism various aspects of English life, the newspaper Press, the Church, and Continental politics.

The political standard as the universal test for truth has been exaggerated; the suppression of one's true opinion is hardly ever counted a vice; our general mental climate is not now invigorating; and we make "a vicious compromise" in exchanging (1) permanent gains of adhering to a sound principle for (2) the temporary gains of departing from it.

Two influences which impair our moral and intellectual nerve are (1) material prosperity and (2) decline in sincerity of spiritual interest.

Religion is no longer an organic power; and

tampering with conviction for fear of its consequences is intensified by the State Church which is "a political army of obstruction to new ideas."

ii

There is a second chapter which is also introductory in character, on "The Possible Utility of Error." Morley asks whether the enlightened classes are to "possess their light in silence," encouraging the less enlightened to believe what *they* don't, but which is useful enough for them to believe? This is snobbery with a vengeance, but it becomes apparent as the discussion proceeds that Morley does not share it. The Church and belief in the supernatural is arraigned as containing two classes of believers. "The *dogmas* are false, but the *liturgy*, as a performance . . . satisfies a sentiment that is both true and indispensable in the human mind." To the plain man this looks like "a deliberate connivance at a plan for the propagation of error." It makes matters worse that the upholders of dogmatic systems have a vast influence in political controversy.

At bottom the idea is that "there is no harm in men being mistaken." Morley flouts that idea, and instances the case of parents allowing their children, and husbands their wives, to believe as true what they believe is untrue. (Women have, however, moved far from the position Morley thought they held when he wrote.)

John Morley on "Compromise"

(1) If it is said, "A false opinion has often clustering round it excellent associations," Morley answers:

(*a*) The virtues tend to become weakened in proportion as the association with the false opinions was strong.

(*b*) To substitute a weak for a strong defence is harmful, seeing there are good reasons for all good habits.

(2) If it is said, "For the mass of men, use and wont . . . and superstitions are the only safe guardians of the common virtues," Morley answers:

"Whatever impairs the brightness of such light as a man has, is not useful but hurtful. . . . Superstition does an immense harm by enfeebling rational ways of thinking."

(3) If it is said, "A (relatively) false opinion may entail less harm than would be wrought by its mere demolition," Morley answers:

"The repudiation of error is not at all the same thing as embracing truth." You want "to reach people's general way of thinking; to stir their love of truth. . . . If this be so, a false opinion, like an erroneous motive, can hardly have even a provisional usefulness. . . . In exterminating one false opinion you may be hindering the growth of an uncounted brood of false opinions." The utmost that can be said is that errors "are inevitable elements in human growth."

John Morley on "Compromise"

iii

Morley's third chapter, on "Intellectual Responsibility," comes into closer grips with the subject of Compromise.

Playing tricks with conscience produces intellectual improbity, "infidelity to truth, the disloyalty to one's own intelligence."

For those who make "a brazen compromise with what they hold despicable, lest they should have to win their bread honourably," Morley has a scathing word: "They have a hell of their own, words can add no bitterness to it."

Next, we must not say: "If a subject is not ripe for practical treatment, you and I are therefore entirely relieved from the duty of having clear ideas about it." On the contrary, it is because "opinion and nothing but opinion can effect great permanent changes, that we ought to be careful to keep this most potent force honest, wholesome, fearless and independent. . . . It is worth while to take pains to find out the best way of doing a given task." There may be considerations which "rightly make us acquiesce in a second-best course of action, in order to avoid stagnation or retrogression." But if we "in our own minds acquiesce in second-best opinions," that is compromise in making up one's mind.

In making up our minds "we have nothing to do with the circumstance that it is not practicable."

Morley then draws illustrations from what he

calls "The Political Spirit," or "The House of Commons' view of human life—a view excellent in its place, but most blighting and dwarfing out of it." With the system of self-government has grown the habit of giving way to the will of the majority. There has been engendered the real sense of "political responsibility" to the discouragement of "intellectual responsibility." The political spirit "limits the subjects in which the men animated by it can take a real interest": (1) men lose sincere concern about the larger questions which the human mind has raised up for itself, and (2) they lose a fearless desire to reach the true answers to them. The political spirit makes men "afraid of the conclusions to which free inquiry might bring them." The ill consequences of such compromise are great: (1) "this unspoken bargaining with the little circle of his fellows which constitutes the world of a man"; (2) "dulling the edge of responsibility, deadening the sharp sense of personal answerableness either to a God, or to Society, or to a man's own conscience and intellectual self-respect."

"Opinions do not come to naught," says Morley; they at least influence our own conduct. Opinions are "an extremely important part of character. They shape ideals, and it is ideals that inspire conduct." Morley defines Conservatism and Liberalism, and then urges that we should return to their principles instead of dwelling exclusively on practical compromises.

In many cases what is mistaken for toleration is indolence, timidity, indifference, carelessness or light-hearted neutrality. "We have to fight and do lifelong battle against the forces of darkness, and anything that turns the edge of reason blunts the surest and most potent of our weapons."

iv

Morley next devotes a chapter to "Religious Conformity," which is really a sustained plea for nonconformity to prevailing religious beliefs and for free-thinking. Morley was (as Mr F. W. Hirst points out) deeply concerned with religious conformity, a question involving the ethics and expediency of a State Church. No one, says Morley, now thinks the Christian religion originated "in deliberate imposture." "The modern free-thinker does not attack it; he explains it . . . with patience and historic respect." The tendency of modern free-thought is "towards the extraction of the first and more permanent elements of the old faith." Science will still have "to assist in the building up of a new creed by which men can live."

Morley speaks of "us who have made up our minds to face the worst and to shape, as best we can, a life in which the cardinal verities of the common creed shall have no place." Those who agree with Morley are not sceptics. "They positively, absolutely and without reserve reject

as false the whole system of objective propositions which make up the popular belief of the day and all of its theological expressions. The difference is a difference of opinion."

It is a duty not to conceal such dissent; but such avowal is uncommon. People "remain valetudinarians so long as a curtain of compromise shelters them from the real belief of those of their neighbours who have ventured to use their minds with some measure of independence."

Only one exception is allowed by Morley in avowing unbelief — namely, the relationship of child and parents. We are not eager "to murder all the sweetnesses of filial piety in an aggressive eristic."

The case of husband and wife is, apparently, different. Morley's opinion that "women remain in bondage to opinions which so many cultivated men either reject or else hold in a transcendental and non-natural sense" may have been accurate in his day, but is scarcely so to-day. A man does not draw his wife by lot, and Morley thinks she may be expected to ascertain beforehand her future husband's religious attitude. There is no reason why a man should make "a false and hypocritical pretence . . . fearing to give pain to the religious sensitiveness of women." Morley thinks "women are at present far less likely than men to possess a sound intelligence and a habit of correct judgment." But a man is not to obtrude his opinions on his wife, and must "allow his house-

mates to possess their own beliefs in peace." But "when the opportunity meets the free-thinker full in front, he is called upon to speak as freely as he thinks."

As to the education of children conform to common religious belief, this Morley thinks may be left to the wife, subject (1) to the husband's veto if the theology to be instilled contains "any of those wicked and depraving doctrines which neither Catholicism nor Calvinism is without, in the hands of some professors," and (2) to the husband taking no part "in baptismal or other ceremonies which are to him no better than mere mummeries." The great object is to keep the minds of the young as open as possible in the matter of religion. "There is no reason why they should not know the best parts of the Bible as well as they know the Iliad or Herodotus." But "that a man who regards it solely as supreme literature should impress it upon the young as the supernaturally inspired word of God, and the accurate record of objective occurrences, is a piece of the plainest and most shocking dishonesty."

Next, should a man proclaim his opinions if to do so will cost him the means of subsistence? Morley says this will depend on the value he sets on his opinions, and "No one has a right to demand the heroic from all the world." But "a man should surely dare to live his small span of life with little heed of the common speech upon him or his life."

John Morley on "Compromise"

v

Morley's last chapter deals with "The Realization of Opinion," and in this a man's attitude should be less inflexible. It is unreasonable to lose patience and quarrel with one's time. A whole community cannot be made at once to submit to new ideas. "Perpetual Compromise is an indispensable accompaniment of a normal development" (said Mr Spencer, in his *Study of Sociology*), but Morley adds we must not press this argument too far.

There may be (1) *legitimate compromise*, in which a man holds his opinions courageously, "but neither forces nor expects the whole world straightway to follow," or (2) *illegitimate compromise*, in which "the compromiser rejects the highest truth or dissembles his own acceptance of it."

"Changes can only be initiated by individuals or very small groups of individuals." A man holding certain beliefs holds a trust. "It is always one who is first to leave the old encampment." By proclaiming their opinions, the members of the band know one another. If the time for action has not come for them, at least it has come for this man. He must "draw opinion in every way open to him—by speech, by voting, by manner of life and conduct—in the direction of new truth and the better practice. The history of success . . . is the history of minorities."

But "we ought never to press our ideas up to

their remotest logical issues, without reference to the conditions in which we are applying them." (1) A small reform (if not made with reference to some large progressive principle and with a view to further extension of its scope) makes it all the more difficult to return to the right line. (2) A small reform may be represented as settling the matter, putting men's minds "in a posture of contentment which is not justified."

We may correct our impatience by looking back upon the past. While we must have patience and moderation in political practice, "no such considerations present themselves in the matters which concern the shaping of our own lives, or the publications of our social opinions." By "obedience to the voice of our better selves" we maintain or increase the quantity of conscience or conscientiousness in a community.

Persuasion and not force must be the weapon for realizing our opinions. Earnestness of conviction is compatible with a sense of liability to error. The consciousness that he may be wrong will restrain a man from intolerance. "You have not converted a man because you have silenced him . . . as one who should fire a blunderbuss to put out a star."

There must be full liberty of ideas and conduct in society, which is a growing organism, (1) because no one knows "for certain what novelties will prove of enduring value," and (2) because, even if they are not, there is a risk of keeping

back social growth at some other point. Liberty is a condition, and on it depends the prosperity of any abstract idea.

"It is better to wait, and to defer the realization of our ideas until we can realize them fully, than to defraud the future by truncating them, if truncate them we must, in order to secure a partial triumph for them in the immediate present."

V

The Dilettante and Books

READING should be looked upon as a department of life, a business quite as much as a pleasure. It is in danger of being crushed out by the picture-show and dancing, in regard to which there are fewer dilettanti than there ought to be! The worst feature of amusements run mad is that they make dilettanti in the serious things of life.

Dilettanteism in regard to books is a regrettable feature of modern times. Many people read anything and everything. Some people read the newspapers and nothing else. Some people even read the leaders in their daily newspaper, the general subjective effect of which, however, is mainly one of annoyance. The reason of that is that the writer of the articles proceeds on the startling assumption that his readers are fools with vacant minds into which he can pour anything he likes. They resent that attitude as affecting their *amour propre* as well as their appetite for breakfast.

Dilettanteism accounts for the spread of literary indigestion, which malady all the Doctors of Literature have not only failed to cure or check, but have greatly spread. The vast majority of people who do read take in, but they do not give

out. Comparatively few people even speak about the books they read. Hence arises the indigestion.

In the reading of books, the dilettante is a browser and not a student. He is desultory and not intense. He usually reads without method, and, what is worse, without pencil at hand or note-book at his elbow. Note-books are cheap, and so are pencils, but the will or knowledge to use them is not there, and so the mind becomes like a sieve, into which the water of wisdom and knowledge flows but does not collect, and so cannot be poured out again.

It is even some slight preventive of dilettanteism that publishers often issue books with the pages uncut. It is something gained to make people even cut the pages. People who have never blushed since childhood have been known to blush when a book which was given as a Christmas present was found by the donor in the possession of his friend months or years afterwards with the pages uncut! Or perhaps he has cut only the first few pages, and has thereby stamped himself as a dilettante!

The true way of reading is, of course, to read and underline. That is to say, assuming that the book is one's own. Even a subsequent reader of a borrowed book may, however, be glad to find an occasional marginal note of correction, or an underlining here and there, or (if he is a bold person) a question or exclamation mark. Assuming that a book is one's own, it is well to underline all the

passages which arrest attention (or one passage, if there be no more, as frequently happens in certain volumes of four hundred pages). Underlinings are most useful in re-reading the book. By their aid one can re-read a book in a fraction of the time occupied by the first perusal. It is to be mentioned that the pencil should be sharp, as the very sharpening of the pencil helps to sharpen the wits. By continuous reading, one will correct earlier impressions about people and things. A careful reader will transfer to the note-book at his side (on the first page of which he will naturally at some time have written his Will) all the passages which have struck him as notable, although to the writer they may have seemed commonplace. If the reader is of the right sort, who gives out something of what he takes in, he will carry his note-book frequently with him and make his knowledge available to others. Thus he leaves his dilettanteism behind, and becomes a keen and enthusiastic student of books.

The dilettante is good for something. He can at least enjoy what is a favourite pastime of some people, and sit down in front of a bookcase and merely look at the backs and bindings of his books. The books of a book-lover are not the kind to be found in the libraries of the *nouveaux riches*. There are no long series of classical authors in beautiful bindings, but with never a page thumb-marked. His books are a collection, the slow accumulation of years, and books mostly

bought at some sacrifice. Many are presents, and some few may have been borrowed and not returned, and so are stolen. Nearly every book of a book-lover has a history and association of its own. If one is searching for a subject for a lecture or article, there is no better preparation than to take a chair before one's bookcase. It is not necessary for at least ten minutes to touch one of the books. The sight of a name or a title, or even a binding, will awaken thoughts that have long slept. They will start up the mental machinery. Fundamental principles which may have become through the years woven into the texture of one's mind are made to stand out sharply by the mere sight of some books. Here may be a title which reminds one of views, at one time expressed with great tenacity and enthusiasm, which the maturity of years has discarded. Again there is an anthology, or a book of poems, which may lead the mind to wander in forgotten green meadows with the sunlight upon them, and beside still waters. There on another shelf are the stately bindings of University prizes of early days, the very sight of which makes one feel learned.

But the dilettante is discovered by the fact that, after gazing, he goes away without taking out a single book. And so he is through life. He is the artist who only dreams of the picture he is going to paint, but never paints. He is one of those "who live on the reputation of the reputation they might have made."

VI

The Countryside

"Those shadowy recollections
Which, be they what they may,
Are yet the fountain light of all our day,
Are yet a master light of all our seeing."
WORDSWORTH'S *Ode.*

THE stream of life flows on. One generation follows another, and we of the present time must work our days out and then pass on, while other hands take up the tasks from which ours must loosen. Look across the strath, or up the glen, or down by the wind-swept shore, and think how little these have changed for generations. Here a wood has disappeared, there another has grown; here, heather, whin or bracken has crept over because of someone's neglect, there they have disappeared by another's work of reclamation. But the bed of that stream runs in its old course; the hill-face that makes the horses sweat and halt rises where it did, and the road and broken farm-track wind up the hill as of old. The face of Nature alters little, except in an æon of time, and we recognize the familiar outlines, although the flush or sternness of the seasons come and go, and the scars and furrows deepen.

We think of other times, and of the men and

women who have toiled and moiled on these same fields that their successors alternately bless and blame. The marks of the sluggard or dullard, who neglected his tasks, in some places still appear; but in others the planning mind and busy hands of other workers have done wonders in the well-drained field, the straightened marches, the stones cleared off, the tidy houses or the firm-bottomed road. The heirs in that heritage are in turn daily massing a legacy of weal or of woe for the next generation in the manner and quality of their work.

The Voice of the Past

If, having eyes, we could in imagination see into the dim past and watch the men and women as they wrought; if, having ears, we could hear the lilt, the snatch of song, and all the "unheard melodies" of their daily life, with what awe would we pass to and fro every day. Not a field or haugh or barn but is historic of the lives of the men and women of other days. Their lives may have been even and calm to dullness, broken by few quarrels or losses, and enlivened by little interest or joy. Or they may have been lived when great movements or crises swept the land, and a homestead may have been at one time a storm-centre or at another a haven. They may have been embittered and stained by tragedy when the evil of the heart bore fruit; or they may have been as homes of sunshine and comfort, known to

neighbours for miles around. In short, were not these lives, lived out in other days, very much like our own, in variety, in influence and in weighty moment, issuing out in final condemnation or praise?

One story of a life might be told in few words, while another might run to volumes. In that long vista of lives lived long ago, one toiler after another came upon these very fields as a youth and left them old. Each renewal of his occupancy found him greyer, more rugged and tanned, having his debts paid and a little over, but wealthy beyond dreams in the things that remain. Another may have come young and died young, leaving a widow who bravely carried on in a lonely struggle until the day came when their boy could do his father's work. Again, another home was for ever famous as the birthplace of sons who went out from it to startle the world by their message, or their deeds or discoveries.

Earth's Charm and Secret

Truly, "we end but a little way from where we began." Our own lives are outwardly but copies of any half-dozen of our predecessors—we may choose which we care as being most like our own. The natural environment has changed little —perhaps a railway or motor has come, bringing far places near, linking us closer with our fellows, but robbing us of something of our peace. But

it is "the stream of life" that counts, and, however similar each life may seem, every one is inwardly different and individually of eternal value. This immutable earth has no charm—indeed has no existence—except for the men and women and little children who live on it. The fields are no other or better than the clods of which they are made but for the eyes of men and women who look on them, or the laughter of the children who pick the daisies. "The Earth calls for men and women and children as Love for its mate."

So, in a question of values, we know where we stand. Land has value only because other men have been, and we are, here upon it. It provides means of livelihood for us and ours, and helps in the vast scheme by which the world of men exists. It is the labour and industry of the generations that are gone, and of ourselves, that have made the land what it is in value and in potentiality for the coming days, and we maintain its power. It was without doubt created for man, and man is its lord.

Man and his Worth

Shelley makes the Earth say: "Heaven, hast thou secrets? Man unveils me; I have none."

And so, amid all the wealth of Nature which surrounds us, it is WE who are of worth in the eternal values. Of what character are WE? Are we "in tune" with Nature, and have we learned her secrets and her Maker's? Have we been

able to raise our thoughts each day above the material things — beautiful, engrossing, money-making though they be? Are these fields of clods or smiling fields to us, full of meaning and welcome to our hearts with each morning's dew? We are different from the men and women who lived and worked here generations ago, but are we better, truer, more honest, of deeper knowledge and wider appreciation? Do we live for ourselves alone—our mental horizon bounded by the hills at our doors, or far-flung to embrace our fellows beyond—"a chain of linkèd thought, of love and might to be divided not"?

"Man, one harmonious soul of many a soul,
Whose nature is its own divine control,
Where all things flow to all, as rivers to the sea."

VII

Flowers

The history of flowers stretches back into the dim ages of Time, but their joys and attractiveness are perennial. To glorify flowers, and to encourage their æsthetic appeal from generation to generation, is indeed a noble and even a sacramental task.

The honoured names of the pioneers of flower culture are eloquent of lives spent in the worship of beauty. The work of these men and women lives after them, and the flowers of to-day are their living memorial. Their spirits are where flowers immortal bloom, but their memories are like a sweet-smelling perfume, because of their self-sacrificing efforts to enthrone an ideal, and to crown a queen.

Men and women of every shade of belief in religion or politics meet on common ground to "consider the lilies." Flowers are common to all religions. Flowers, fortunately, have no politics, and it would be an evil day if politicians were ever to "say it with flowers." We hope the time will never come when the Home Ruler will send out a Scots thistle as an Election Address. The primrose has nearly redeemed itself from an association which once sullied its beauty, and we trust that no

party will ever seek to appropriate to itself any flower whose beauty is for all.

It is very difficult to speak in prose of flowers and their beauty. It is really a poet's task, and his wingèd words and gossamer touch are needed to tell the charm of flowers. Flowers bloom in poems as in gardens, and diffuse their fragrance in literature as they do in our rooms. Longfellow

> "Called the flowers, so blue and golden,
> Stars, that in earth's firmament do shine."

and Tennyson apostrophized a

> "Flower in the crannied wall,
> I pluck you out of the crannies,
> I hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
> Little flower—but *if* I could understand
> What you are, root and all, and all in all,
> I should know what God and man is."

How poor a place this world would be without flowers. It is true that Wordsworth, the poet of flowers, sang of the "dancing daffodils," but it was to wild flowers like the celandine that his heart seemed most to warm. After all, it is common flowers like the daisy, violet, buttercup, speedwell, cowslip, poppy or hawthorn which have prompted some immortal lines. Common flowers have inspired some of the finest decorative art. It may be that the higher the species the less is the appeal to the human heart. It is a real sacrifice that, the

greater the perfection in colour and form in the rose, the less is its perfume.

Flowers are our constant companions, often unnoticed and waiting expectant for a word of thanks or appreciation from us, but always faithful in their companionship. They help to make our houses into homes, and constantly speak of joy and brightness. Flowers may cover ground which was once a battlefield; or grow above a grave. But they also bedeck a bride, emblazon a cottage door, and enthral our children, who are the flowers of our homes.

One of the most beautiful thoughts of Oliver Wendell Holmes is contained in the poem without a title in which he tells us how the stars and the flowers agreed with one another to share the task of keeping watch over mankind, the flowers in the daytime, and the stars by night. "From reddening dawn till western skies are burning," the flowers look on at man's doings, sometimes turning white, and often blushing red, at what they see. The stars keep vigil through the dark hours, and what they see often make them twinkle as they "try to shut their saddening eyes."

Some people like in a casual way to see flowers, in a garden or on a table. Some are interested only scientifically or commercially in flowers. Some revel in the names of flowers, Latin or otherwise. But real lovers of flowers find a responsiveness in themselves to flowers. They grow up with them from childhood and associate with them as friends

and companions. Flowers touch the finer chords in their nature, and foster a kindliness, a gentleness and a fineness of feeling which we could ill spare. They bring quiet, contentment and beauty into the heart.

Every child should be interested in flowers at home and in school gardens, teaching them to grow flowers, caring for them and tending them, as things beloved. Here, on the other hand, is the curse of our citied civilization, with its flowerless streets and alleys, its courts and slums, where children by the hundred thousand seldom see a flower and never learn to love them. These barren wildernesses are cheered only by what Ruskin called "a little broken fragment of rainbow" where the window of a worker has its box of flowers. Happy are the men and women and children who can love and work with flowers, and spend with them those unnumbered unthinking hours of friendly companionship.

We may love flowers for their beauty. There are various ways of enjoying flowers, as of enjoying music. Some people enjoy the mechanical formations, the rhythms, phrasing or measure of music; others let the flow of beautiful harmony bathe and envelop their minds and emotions. Similarly with flowers, you may enjoy them petal by petal, and their variety, form and size; or you may let their massed and perfumed beauty enthral your being, charming every sense as with the breath of Paradise.

We may also love flowers for their associations. The real value of flowers lies in the part they take in our personal life or home life. There are the flowers we have planted and tended from their infancy, watching them grow and become beautiful; the homely fuchsias or geraniums that brighten many a humble cottage window; the cabbage rose or honeysuckle trained by loving hands round a doorway. There is the old-fashioned flower border by the wall, skirted by red daisies or saxifrage, or with the musk we got from a friend we have lost; the cuttings we took from our old home; or the ferns which were planted by some of our family who are now in lands beyond the seas. These are the flowers we always love best; not so much for what they are as for what they mean to us. They would fare ill at a flower-show, but not for all the prizes of a show would we barter them.

We may love flowers for their memories. What memories are recalled by a carpet of blue hyacinths in some wooded dell; a belt of gentians in the Alps in spring; a sprig of sweetbrier, or a forget-me-not! Look in an old volume at a pansy or clover leaf pressed between its leaves, and let your memory go back to the fingers that put it there. Memory, imagination and old associations are quickened by the smell of a flower. What strange emotions are called up by the smell of a moss rose or a sprig of thyme! It is then come the "thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears."

Flowers

When the poet sang of "the faith that every flower enjoys the air it breathes," he was thinking of the habit which real lovers of flowers have of treating flowers and thinking of them as if they were human. The best friend of our youth, who loved flowers in that way, used to say as she worked amongst them, "They're just like bodies"; and she believed the roses thanked her as she slackened some hardened earth about their stems, and that the violas gave an imperceptible sigh of relief as she cleared them of weeds that choked them.

In return, flowers have an extraordinary power of sympathy with the human race. They seem to be constantly giving out lavishly in cheer and comfort to us, and pouring out rivers of joy and beauty upon a world which knows enough of sorrow and sordidness.

Nor are those lovers of flowers who personify them very far out in their judgment, because flowers have an uncanny sense and instinct.

Maeterlinck, writing of "The Intelligence of Flowers," said that, condemned as they are to immobility from birth to death, they revolt against this destiny. Their one desire is to escape this fatality and seek wings to conquer space by every means and ingenuity. They employ marvellous systems of dissemination, of propulsion, and navigation of the air, by tendrils, hooks, bursting capsules, and a thousand other astounding mechanisms. In modern developments of science and

engineering we are only discovering and applying many of the principles which have been employed for myriads of years in the intelligent life of flowers. There is the instinct or vision that directs the tendrils of the virginia creeper or the convolvulus towards the handle of a rake or spade resting against a wall. There is the extraordinary intelligence of the orchid family in regard to fertilization. The flowers we treat as insentient and inanimate seem endowed with reason and will.

Dr Henry Ward Beecher, in *Norwood*, even suggested that in the influence of flowers upon mankind they have a moral function, and that there are great truths of the affections seeking through flowers an inlet upon men. The hollyhock, for example, sending sheets of light into the eyes, and rousing in the mind a thousand fancies and yearnings, so that through the exquisite effects of the flower "we almost see through matter into the other life."

So in Longfellow's lines:

> "And with childlike, credulous affection
> We behold their tender buds expand;
> Emblems of our own great resurrection,
> Emblems of the bright and better land."

VIII

Boots and Shoes

THAT immortal Frenchman, Charles Perrault, knew what he was doing when he put Puss into boots and Cinderella into glass slippers. We believe it to be true that Puss's feline courage sank into the place where his boots were to be when he learned of his master's misfortune. No less would Cinderella's heart sink into her "bauchles" when her sisters went to the ball and she was left to her cinders. But it was boots and shoes which were the making of both immortals.

Said Puss to his master: "There is not the least need for you to worry, master. All you have to do is to give me a pouch and get a pair of boots made for me, so that I can walk in the woods." So it all happened that Puss, with his boots on, retrieved his master's fortunes, and himself "became a personage of great importance." It is recorded that the only time his boots worried him was when he sprang on the roof of the Ogre's castle, "for his boots were not meant for walking on the tiles." We can all recall adventurous moments (of which we do not speak) when we, as it were, mounted from life's lower levels, and in our extremities found our sympathies entirely with

Puss. Perrault says that, on receiving the boots which he asked for, Puss gaily pulled them on. The manner is everything, and our sullen humours are now all explained—we do not put on our boots *gaily*. To-morrow we must try.

Undoubtedly Cinderella gaily, if nervously, put on her glass slippers, while the six dappled mouse-grey horses champed their bits. Suppose Cinderella hadn't let fall one of her glass slippers as she fled from the ballroom, how different her history might have been! Nothing will convince us that she didn't mean to do it, for everyone knows that ladies drop things still—if not a slipper, then it is a handkerchief. That is how many adventures begin! The shoemaker who made Cinderella's slippers must have been a marvel at his work, for the fit was so perfect that not one of all the princesses, or the duchesses, or the whole of the Court, or the two sisters, had feet that the slipper would fit. On Cinderella's foot the slipper "slid in without trouble and was moulded to its shape like wax." (Manufacturing papers please copy.) The wisest man in the story was the equerry who insisted on trying the slipper on Cinderella. What if he hadn't!

As Mr A. A. Milne sings:

"There's a cavern in the mountain, where the old men meet.
(Hammer, hammer, hammer . . .
Hammer, hammer, hammer . . .)

They make gold slippers for my lady's feet.
(Hammer, hammer, hammer . . .
Hammer, hammer, hammer . . .)
My lady is marrying her own true knight,
White her gown, and her veil is white,
But she must have slippers on her dainty feet."

Admittedly, boots bind us too much to earth. Our fancy and imagination get too little scope, or at least our boots prevent us acting our wingèd thoughts. Sometimes that is providential. But, although life as a whole is an adventure, there are too few adventures in life. Boots stand for convention, for respectability and for the humdrum. They beat out our daily path for us with a hard surface, and scarcely can a General Strike or a World War push us off that track. Ruts and grooves are our constant menace, and too often the grave of all our initiative and enterprise. A pair of boots is a pair of words, "Safety first," which are too much of a copy-book heading to apply outside of motoring.

A farmer is known by the name of his farm. Our doctor is called "Pills"; our lawyer, "Red Tape," and the handyman at a hotel, "the Boots." We think of the thing; we think of the man. Sam Weller sat with "two rows of boots before him, one cleaned and the other dirty, and at every addition he made to the clean row, he paused from his work and contemplated its results with evident satisfaction." Suppose you had asked Sam Weller,

as he sat there, why a whiting was called a whiting, would he have guessed the reply (as the Gryphon told Alice) because "it does the boots and shoes"? It was blacking that made her boots shine, she said, but the Gryphon explained that, under the sea, boots and shoes are done with whiting, and the boots and shoes are, of course, made of soles and eels. That is an explanation of a phenomenon which is after Sam Weller's own heart.

A far more melancholy spectacle than a graveyard is a hotel corridor at midnight with its rows of boots and shoes at every door. They are as if thrown up by the tide on the shore, but it is a tide of human lives, energies, passions, cataclysms maybe. There are the lonely pairs, the mixed doubles, the tiny tots, the modest, the aggressive, the brutally healthy, the vulgar, the hesitating, the careful and the careless. How tell-tale are these boots and shoes: they are like letters unintentionally left and read. The mud, the knots, the broken lace, the patch, the mend, the worn heels and toes, the brand-new, the stricken old—what volumes of adventure and romance are there; what tales of the humdrum life, the neglected homes and the weary tramp through life.

It is not only in prisons and in the football field that people bear numbers and not names. In factories, people are merely "hands"; in hotels, people are known by their numbers and their tips. Their identity, importance and characteristics all vanish into a mere number, and that number is

affixed to their boots. On their boots there is no respect of persons. It is only (as Sam Weller said) that "the 11 boots is to be called at half past eight."

We listen at midnight to the occupant of the room above coming in and taking off his boots—one at a time. It takes two to make a quarrel, and it takes two boots to make a pair. We endure the anxious suspense, after he has dropped one boot heavily on the floor, of waiting—it seems an age—until the other one falls. Of course boots, like misfortunes, seldom come singly. No doubt the man in the room above thinks that his willing mind makes his foot light.

It may not be permissible to look a gift horse in the mouth, but surely without offence we may look it in the shoe. It is, in fact, the only animal that wears a shoe that does not pinch. Horses and small children get their shoes put on for them. A horse is really of no use until it gets on its shoes. Neither for that matter is a man, as anyone may test on getting up in the morning. Returning consciousness and strength no doubt come with the cold bath, and as each garment is donned, but it is only when he puts shoes on his feet he feels himself at last a man.

People talk of dead men's shoes, and relate how heavy coughing on the part of one of the staff in any of our numerous bureaucracies sets up strong emotions among his junior colleagues, who begin to think not of his cough, but of his shoes.

Metaphorically they may step into his shoes, but literally they cannot. People seldom try to wear one another's shoes. One man's joy is another man's pain.

A man's boots are his very own, until he discards them. His idiosyncrasies of character collect in his feet. His bad temper in chilblains, his hard heart in corns, his ambitions in his big toe. These all have their emplacements in his boots, so that if you know the lineaments of his boots you know the man. How little we dream of what life's secrets we reveal to our bootmaker when we send our boots to be repaired! He is in a way more to be respected than our doctor or lawyer. Nowadays it is the bootmaker who X-rays us. Not with red tape, but with bootlaces are our dossiers tied. Our boots are the précis and epitome of our whole selves. We are indeed down and out when our assets comprise only that lowest ratio of value "an auld pair of shoon."

It has for a long time now been believed that it is by the force of gravitation we are kept in an upright position on the surface of the earth. The most recent thought, however, throws doubt upon that theory, and suggests that it is our boots and shoes which are the governing force. It is not so much their weight, as just their position and flatness. Their inescapable power may be eluded temporarily, when a man puts his slippered feet on the mantelpiece or a boy turns a somersault. But these exceptions only prove the rule. Another

illustration is found in the fact, known to every child, that the people in Australia and New Zealand are, relatively to us, walking on their heads. Obviously they can do so only by the grip on the earth of their boots and shoes. The advantage in the earth being round is that when our kith and kin come back to this country they arrive right end up, thanks to the fact that they wear boots and shoes.

The shoe tied on to or thrown after the wedding coach is, of course, for good luck, but it is the unspoken prayer that he and she may keep their feet. Lose their heads they may and do, else some people say they would never be where they are, but shoes, with their steadying virtue and erecting grace, they must never lack. Awl's well that ends well!

A boy's first interest in leather is not his boots but the tawse. It is not a good start in knowledge. He should be taught to respect his leather-faced parent who earns the money to buy his boots. Barefooted, he should go to the fields to look at the cattle, and by rough drawings on the hides of the raw material calculate how many pairs of boots may be produced from the hides when the cattle have no further use for them. Then he should read of his early ancestor, the first capitalist, who, after scantily clothing himself and his dependents with a hide or two, stored the remainder of his season's kill for future use. Then he should see the farmers who feed the cattle, and are therefore

the premier bootmakers. He will then pass to the premises of the tanner and learn the difference (which isn't much) between him and a well-known silver coin. By the time he has gone through a boot factory, the cattle will have become a dream; and so he may at the university proceed to struggle in the economic nightmares of how tariffs may be scientifically imposed, so as to give the greatest profits with the least injury to all the interests concerned—including his parent, the cattle, the farmer, the tanner and the boot manufacturer.

Of course the shoe pinches sometimes—it may be by our own fault; at any rate the bootmaker never takes the blame. If of two evils we choose the lesser, it is certainly wise of two pairs of boots to choose the bigger. It is said that the fairest shoe may pinch the foot, and so may the dearest. We must not be deceived by appearances, even in boots. Why add another pinch to all the pinches of which life is made up—the pinch of circumstance, the pinch of want, the pinch of work and (a cynic might add) the pinch of wife? We soon realize the difference between the Walkinease and the Walkincheap.

Within certain latitudes we might surely sometimes take risks for our soul's and the nation's good, and seek untrodden ways. It is the lure of ease that we all shall become Civil Servants with pensions, with no risks to speak of, and having our boots or shoes on all the time. Mr Chesterton's Manalive (alias Innocent Smith), in order to

break out of the routine of his life, breaks into his own house by the chimney! He lost his wife a series of excellent servants by knocking at the door as a total stranger, and asking if Mr Smith lived there, and what kind of man he was! It is not an example to be generally followed, but we can understand the motive and the state of mind. We are invited to fling off our boots and shoes, and swim for fame and fortune of our own making and for achieving some lasting good for others.

At any rate, for us our shoes point the way to us—straight on; turning our feet neither to the right hand nor to the left; putting our heel on no man's neck, and grinding none but evil beneath our heel; standing upright upon our feet; and on holy ground taking off our shoes.

IX

Tramps

Robert Louis Stevenson, in his essay on *Walking Tours*, speaks of "the hope and spirit with which the march begins at morning, and the peace and spiritual repletion of the evening's rest. . . . You come to a milestone on a hill, or some place where deep ways meet under trees; and off goes the knapsack, and down you sit to smoke a pipe in the shade. You sink into yourself, and the birds come round and look at you, and your smoke dissipates upon the afternoon under the blue dome of heaven; and the sun lies warm upon your feet, and the cool air visits your neck and turns aside your open shirt. If you are not happy, you must have an evil conscience."

Similarly Hazlitt, in his essay *On Going a Journey* (a passage quoted by Stevenson): "Give me the clear blue sky over my head, and the green turf beneath my feet, a winding road before me, and a three hours' march to dinner—and then to thinking. [Not, you will observe, "to bed"!] It is hard if I cannot start some game on these lone heaths. I laugh, I run, I leap, I sing for joy."

It is all very idyllic, and the charm of such sentiment and language captivates the mind. We

relish again many an experience of just such a kind as we have often had.

But to what extent do you think is the zest of such walking tours shared by a common tramp? To him it is pure transcendentalism. He remarks in his brusque way: "If ye *had* to do it like me, ye wadna' do it!" Stevenson and Hazlitt and you and I have walked for pleasure: the tramp from grim necessity. If the tramp has felt the romance and the thrill of it, even now and again, then who will grudge him these moments in Elysium? It may be that some tramps at some moments have enjoyed, as they trudged along, what Hazlitt speaks of as "that undisturbed silence of the heart which alone is perfect eloquence." For the most part, if the truth were told, the average tramp drags along in utter loneliness of heart; his eyes downcast, without hope or zest, hearing no bird songs, and seeing only the dust of the road.

What makes men tramps? Every tramp has his own life-story. One tramp summed up his in a sentence—"I missed my chance," he said. The tide in his affairs had swept up to him, and he knew not that it was the flood on which now or never his barque must sail; or, knowing it, some weakness of will or an ignoble purpose held him back, and the tide flowed out never to return.

Many a hardened tramp started on his course by running away from home as a boy. It may be

harsh treatment, a homeless home, a strain of some pirate ancestor, a spirit of revolt, some desolating sorrow, the call of the wild, the thirst for adventure—but as likely as not the crime or sin of one evil hour from which he flees.

In some men there is a restlessness, which in higher ranks of society we call a "divine discontent" and in another we call "going on the tramp." One man confessed that it still came over him, although he had to all appearances "settled down," with wife and children. As a boy he had run away to sea, had worked his passage up the Seine, had enlisted in the Foreign Legion, but escaped before joining up, had tramped endless miles in Spain, drank and fought in cabarets, and returning to Scotland had tramped its length and breadth, and finally lost a limb in service in our Mercantile Marine. If you met that man on the road, "without a bean" in his pocket (as he would say), you might give him a coin and pass on, all unknowing that you had for a moment brushed against a life full of romance and adventure.

Among tramps are to be found men drawn from every rank of society and walk of life. There is a man tramping along the road by the side of a moor over which he had once shot. Another is a Cambridge scholar, whose culture is sometimes betrayed in a tone, a word, or a mannerism. Another is a minister of religion, stickit or deposed, with faith and reverence gone.

Many are men with a University degree; or

with a broken professional career behind them. Probably most are of the common ranks, with only a smattering of education, without a trade or any aptitude for work of any kind, generally known as "casuals," ill-tongued fellows of the baser sort, born and bred in city slums.

Many men are temporary tramps, in search of work. A contract finishes, men are discharged, and they must take to the road in search of new work. They cannot afford a railway ticket; and so they must walk, sometimes fifty or a hundred or more miles, until they are lucky enough to find a job. You may meet him *en route*, trudging along his twenty-odd miles a day, with his worldly belongings tied in a red handkerchief in his hand or slung over his shoulder on a stick. He is clad in trousers and coat, and sometimes a vest. His buttonless coat flaps in the wind, displaying a rough shirt, none too clean. He is collarless as to his bare bronzed neck; his trousers are torn, and sag over his boots. These can be called boots only as a courtesy title, for they are sadly worn, with gaping sides and with holes in the soles of them; they are tied together with an end of string, and white withal with the dust of the road. It may be weeks or months before he finds work, and weary and footsore, discouraged, hungry and heartsick, he must visit docks, bridges or roads under construction, electricity works, and contractors' yards by the dozen before his luck is in. Then "Thank God—at last!" he says.

So, for one reason or another, men tramp. They usually are alone, although some have their women and possibly a child or two with them. They have no home, and so are unburdened with house-rent, and know nothing of rates and taxes. They have no neighbours with whom to fraternize or quarrel, as the case may be. They have no social amenities to observe, no engagements to keep, no religious calls upon them, no vote—and therefore undisturbed by political strivings—and no income-tax returns. Their only connection with the law is to evade it, as an Irishman among them might say. They have "no fixed place of abode." They are the nomads and Bedouins of society.

They have to a large extent reverted to a state of nature. There are as few claims upon them as if they were on a desert island. The claims which they make on other people are not, however, in the same ratio. They do not use tents like the gipsies; they sleep under the open sky when they cannot get a barn or shed or other roof over their heads. A haystack is to them a bed of down; deep dry heather has for them a spring like a mattress; and a levelled hollow under a projecting sandbank is for them a canopied shelter from wind and rain.

On a summer night the hardship is slight compared with the exposure on cold frosty nights with the thermometer low. Many men go down under the severity, and often die, as they have lived, under the sky of heaven, while the stars

keep watch, and only their last sighs break the silence of the night.

Of course there are lodging-houses, but these are in the towns, and tramps are often far from towns. But if they are fortunate enough to have a little money they can afford a bed in a lodging-house at the cost of a few pence. It has also the attraction of company, which they enjoy for a short time for a change, and there is always a certain companionship even in the lighted streets and warm glow of shops and houses.

The late Rev. Duncan Macnicol, United Free Church minister of Stockbridge, Edinburgh, tells how he cultivated the friendship of the class known as "the homeless, ragged, unfriended tramp," and "walked with them in daylight and at midnight; sullen or talkative, drunk and sober." Mr Macnicol describes the death and funeral of a tramp whom a racking cough and a rapid consumption compelled to seek refuge in a disused mine-shaft where an engine was still worked and where the furnaces afforded some warmth. He was a religious tramp, grateful when passages of Scripture were read to him, and occasionally crooning a familiar hymn. There, in loneliness and cold, death came to him at last as a deliverer. This nameless tramp received a parish burial, without shroud, pall or tears, and with the policeman, the Poor Inspector and the parson as chief mourners.

The pathos and tragedy of it! What may the boyhood and youth of this man have been which

faded out in such poverty and loneliness? Yet may not the Recording Angel write his life-story also with a tremble in his hand as he dips his golden pen in sunshine, just as he will write the story of each of us?

Without doubt, drink and the public-house are the cause of many a man becoming a tramp, and keeping him a tramp to his life's end. It is true that it is often only in a public-house that a tramp gets a blink of warmth, light and the company of his fellows. A drink may revive his heart and endurance for a time, and brace him for the road again. The country inn, as he passes from village to village, is an ever-present temptation he cannot resist. There he leaves the coppers he has scraped together, and slouches on. But often he takes too much—especially if a few others like himself forgather at an inn—and then the roadside and oblivion!

Once, when fishing in the dusk, we came on three such tramps lying below a bridge by the side of a river which was then in high spate. All three were helplessly drunk; one was a few yards from the rushing water; another lay nearer, and was soaking wet by having fallen into the water, and had dragged himself out again somehow; and the third was just on the water's edge when we scrambled down to him. After some trouble we got them up the steep bank, through or under a fence, and on the road again and to comparative safety.

But the unlovely truth about some tramps must

be told in plain prose. It is drink that makes tramps dangerous. Hunger and desperation sometimes make them menacing or offensive to other pedestrians; but usually it is drink that rouses the desperado in them. A tramp has attacked a woman on a lonely road or on an isolated croft. He has forced his way into a house and obstreperously refused to leave without money or food. Usually he insists on getting money, and often throws away food given to him. His language may be foul and abusive. A tramp is undoubtedly a nuisance and source of danger when he goes about farm-steadings, lies down in the straw in a barn or a shed while under the influence of drink, and begins to light a pipe. The lighted match thrown down may mean destruction of the steading, and probably of the tramp himself. It is not an inhospitable feeling but a proper precaution that makes farmers lock their byres and barns.

The decent tramp drinks little, and willingly offends none. He will gratefully accept a plate of soup or some bread and meat in a kitchen or at the door. He does not habitually beg, but he will ask for any kind of work. He may crave leave to sleep in an outhouse, and will go on his way next morning before anyone is up. He will lie on your straw as comfortably as you on your mattress, for as one tramp said, "My back is as hard as a badger's!" He is civil, if not refined; he is entertaining, if somewhat garrulous; he is

respectable, even if unwashed; he is honest, though in beggary; he is a brother man, albeit he is a tramp.

Tramps are a problem of our civilization. They are in it but scarcely of it. Unemployment creates them, and it often happens that once a tramp, always a tramp. From being amateurs they tend to become professionals. Then the offer of work frightens them, and work itself tires and annoys them. They roam the country without aim or destination, here to-day and there to-morrow, useless and a nuisance, yet harmless enough to be tolerated. From the local authority of a district they get "lines" entitling them to a night's board and lodging; and on they go to the next. They cannot work, to beg they are not ashamed. Trading on our sympathy, yet independent enough to insist on going their own way.

Most of the tramps there are will remain with us. In a less tolerant and easy-going country than ours they would be taken in hand by the authorities and compelled to settle in work. But we treasure the liberty of the subject, and it is still not a criminal offence to tramp.

As trade and industry flourish in the country, some will be absorbed into steady employment and cease to tramp. The others will continue to tramp until they die. What we can try to do is to prevent new tramps coming into existence. If full employment can be maintained for everyone, there will be at least fewer tramps. If each of us

acted oftener as our brother's keeper, we might often save a man from becoming a tramp.

But, after all, there are more tramps in the country than are to be found in the lodging-houses and on the roads. There are sorners and drifters, beggars and vagrants, idlers and ne'er-do-weels in many other ranks of society than that of tramps.

Next time we overtake a tramp on the road let us stop the car, and at least give him a lift on his way.

X

Adventure

The very mention of the word awakens thoughts of voyages of discovery, situations of danger, and deeds of daring. Like a flash we are transported to the Coral Island; we are living in the tree-house with the Swiss Family Robinson; or gazing apprehensively with Robinson Crusoe at the print of a naked foot on the beach. We are watching the brightly lit *Nautilus* in the heart of the Mysterious Island; or enduring hardship with the Fur Traders; or storming San Domingo with Sir Francis Drake and his gallant band of youths, or boarding a prize he has seized off the Spanish coast. To speak of adventure revives our boyish dreams of sailing-ships and pirates, of redskins and cannibals. In imagination we roam the world, through forests and over mountains, in snow and ice, by sea and river, on plain and desert, in the jungle, in the Andes, or up the Nile. Again we live through hair-breadth escapes, dashes for life, plots and counter-plots, and every kind of thrilling moment.

What is Adventure?

It is to go out towards the unknown; to sail uncharted seas and unplumbed channels; to follow

the gleam; to take risks and hazards; to undertake hopeless enterprises and to attempt the impossible. It calls for courage and boldness, for resource and daring, for faith and foresight, in men and women who know not the meaning of the word "impossible." The Spanish priests and savants laughed at Columbus and his conviction that a great continent lay beyond the Atlantic, but he adventured and found America. For many centuries it was believed that the earth was flat instead of globular, until the latter theory was put to the test and proved correct. To tell the history of adventure is to record all human progress. To sing its praise is to sing a stave in the New Song. To breathe its spirit is to know the romance of life, the joys of attempt, the dreams of glory and the thrill of accomplishment.

To adventure is to be human; nay, it is to be at our best. It is an attribute of the human kind, inherent and common to all. Since ever the spark of greatness or the divine was struck in human soul, man has set out on its great adventure of knowledge. Since then, men have sought to know, are now seeking to know, and still will seek. Omniscience has no need to be adventurous; but the finite groping mind has no other means of growth. For long æons of past time men have gone out to conquer difficulty, and until the last morning star arises they will still seek if haply they may find.

Adventure

Adventure in Youth

From one generation to another the love of adventure awakens in the child mind, and continues through life, until extinguished or lost. Look at a child at play—apparently engrossed with tin soldiers, tattered dolls, or battered bricks. It is not so! Its mind is full to overflowing of fantasy and fiction. This humble room is a castle hall; kings and knights, queens, princesses and fair ladies throng its courts, fairies dance on its battlements, and brave warriors meet in tourney on the meadows. Round everything it possesses the child casts a halo of romance, and weaves a gossamer robe of radiance. Some wood-shavings will make a seashore, with sunken rocks over which waves are breaking; some rags on a stool will make a real mountain, with pass and precipice complete. Round a lighthouse of bricks, two feet high, the child sees enacted before its eyes an epic of adventure and bravery. Against the lighthouse, waves of crinkled paper are breaking, and a match-box, with matches for masts, is a ship in distress amid the stormy seas.

You look at a boy reading by the fireside, but you do not realize that he is thousands of miles away. He is living amid stirring movements, headlong races, rescues, mêlées and escapes. Stalking and plunging, he goes; now flushed, now weary; in woods by night, on river by day; through mountain pass, in cave or camp. To him it

is all grim reality, and for one brief hour he lives a life worth living, and tastes the zest of adventure.

You walk with him up the bed of a tiny burn in a Scottish glen, and if you talk to him you may get absent-minded answers—for he is not there! His mind has transfigured this drab and unexciting place, until it has become a forest glade peopled by savage tribes. He is expectant of ambush at every step, and is on the outlook for beasts of prey. It is you—dull and uninteresting object that you are—who bring him back from these romantic scenes to earth and reality, to realize that that is a burn in Scotland, and that the path has a notice upon it "Trespassers will be prosecuted." The thought may well humble you to the dust with remorse.

The real life of youth is no less full of adventures. The first day at school at the age of five, the first pair of long trousers, the first train journey, the first shave, the first day a girl puts her hair up or has it shingled. What adventures are these! The setting out to a boarding-school, the first grown-up party, the first day at factory or office, the first entering the big world, the first trip to London, or the first long voyage. What adventures are these! Then the discovery of oneself! Then marriage—which is a continuous adventure, filling twenty volumes! The struggles with fortune or misfortune, the battling against odds; how full of adventure, until the last call comes to adventure into an unknown spirit

world, from which we came and to which we hasten.

Participation in manly sport is a fine form of adventure for youth. It is not enough to watch sport as mere onlookers, although often that is the nearest that millions of people ever get to sport. But to play outdoor games of all kinds is continuous adventure, and admirably supplies a real human need, especially in these days of hustle and the strenuous life. It keeps people sane and healthy-minded. It occupies, especially for youth, many an unguarded hour which might otherwise become the prey of evil thoughts and unlawful desires.

What Youth may become

Not every youth is or becomes an adventurer. His lines may fall in pleasant places and, nursed in the lap of luxury, with wealth and position, and under no necessity to toil or care, he grows up, and goes through life as easily as possible, and dies without the world knowing that he has lived. But it may be that a son or daughter has in them the fire of ambition, the very stuff of which adventurers are made, but their relatives, or some grim, soulless environment, may have confined their lives, blighted their hopes and quenched the spark. These pass into old age treasuring only regrets for unfulfilled hopes, and sighing for the chance they missed, and the adventure for which all keenness has now passed.

Adventure

Trades or professions are often chosen for lads and girls for which they have no aptitude, and from which their inclinations turn away. Forced professions may be as soul-destroying as forced marriages. A calling in life may be chosen less by fitness than by fortune, and more for security than for service. Thus, many youths drift into the Civil Service, they or their parents being lured by the good pay offered to youths while still in their teens. In these occupations they seek a safe competence, increasing by regular amounts, within definite limits, and ensuring a pension in old age. For many whose temperament, education and upbringing suits them for such occupations there need be no regret. Tragedies occur, however, when youths of brilliant parts and adventurous souls find themselves confined in situations which become only more irksome to them every day; and they chafe and fret against their lot, until courage and opportunity to change disappear.

Safety First

The antithesis of adventure is Safety First. Now, this is sound advice for driving an engine or a motor-car, especially where the lives of others depend upon it. In such cases it is not permissible for us to take risks, because we are risking more than ourselves and playing with lives which are not ours.

Safety First is also an admirable rule for

investing money, and in business or employment. Nay, it is peremptory for a man to observe care in these matters if he have wife or family, or other dependents. He has the lives and interests of others to consider; they would suffer if he took risks and failed.

Nor can we withhold sympathy with the desire to ensure against the risks of unemployment, sickness or old age for ourselves, and much more in view of the disastrous results of these misfortunes upon those dependent upon us. The fear of want is real and haunting with millions of people. They yearn for security against the risks of life which might overwhelm not only themselves but also those dear to them. "If our bread were only sure," they say, "we might adventure much."

It is to meet this very human need that insurance of every kind has been established. We insure against loss of life, health, limb, estate and employment. In one sense this is simply thrift, and we pay periodical premiums into funds in order that we may, when need arises, draw them out again to recoup ourselves against loss, or to afford us pensions when we can no longer earn money. An individual may not be able to do all these for himself, but in co-operation with his fellows, with averages spread over thousands or millions of others, it can be done with great advantage.

The desire for safety amid the risks of life is in many cases temperamental. Some people are born equipped with life-belts. Many people outside of

Aberdeen are naturally cautious. In infancy they were probably taught to look well at each place on which they were to put their feet, and they have never forgotten the lesson. They practise this foresight to the end. In this respect they have not put away childish things. It takes a War or a General Strike to impair the provision they have made against contingency or misfortune.

Safety First is, however, no creed for youth. There is something uncanny or unhealthy in a young person who invariably chooses the path of least resistance or safety. To be young is to dare. Youth's ideals are on the mountain-tops, and it is their joy to scale the heights that lead to them. To choose the broad flat road, well fenced and smooth, betokens a craven spirit.

It is a pathetic story that of John Fletcher, the nineteen-year-old public-school boy who went to Canada in search of adventure, and returned as a stowaway in a White Star liner. He said he was unable to endure the humdrum existence in England. His adventure at least enabled him to get an article published in a leading daily paper, in which he wrote:

"There is nothing left to discover, nothing left at which to marvel or wonder. All lands have been explored; frontiers no longer hold any mystery. Gone are the days of the sloop and the brig; the pirate and the bold buccaneer. . . . I went to Canada at the age of seventeen to escape the suffocating comfort of home life."

His feelings are not difficult to understand, and they are probably shared by an unnumbered host whose minds are in revolt against their environment. Their souls are like caged birds, and they cry: "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?" They have the hearts of pioneers and the courage of adventurers, but they are chained to their narrow unromantic environment.

Fletcher's outburst, too, represents the natural and admirable feeling which longs for action and adventure, but finds no scope for either in the "suffocating comfort" of modern life. Most boys or girls who have run away from home have really been running away from what seemed to them the imprisonment of their lives. They were wrestling to get out of it, somehow and somewhere. You may criticize the action they took; it may have been in many cases selfish, heartbreaking to those left behind, and disastrous to themselves. It is at least well if we can understand with sympathy something of the hurricane commotion in their hearts before they made escape from their environment.

It is customary to speak of the unrest of modern times, and no doubt there is much shallowness and apparent want of seriousness. These may be less than appears on the surface. They are partly the result of the highly artificial character of modern ways of life. We live far from Nature, in whose presence there is always stillness, depth and meaning. It is the restlessness and thirst for

the excitement of adventure, and the desire to leap the barriers of ordinary life, which tempts men and women to indulge in excessive drinking, in gambling, in drugs or other forms of frenzy. They are the last resort of people who dare not be alone with themselves.

Youth is constantly seeking to realize its individuality. With the years of adolescence comes the instinct or realization of being equipped with the faculties of manhood or womanhood. The desire to realize that personality which is the discovery of youth becomes persistent day and night. The spirit of adventure has come, and youth is eager to set sail on the high seas of life.

That, after all, ought to be the object of every man and woman, not only in youth but while life lasts. It is to develop our own individual personality, to put every talent to usury, and to do so not for selfish aggrandizement but for the service of our fellow-men, and to leave this world better than we found it. Why else should we live at all?

Men and women do not realize their personality in societies or in unions, in clubs or in churches, but as individual souls. Each is an entity, separate and alone, at birth, at death, and without doubt during every moment between. Co-operate, we may; live together, we must; but not for one instant of time does the individual soul lose its responsible personality, which is apart from every other being in the world.

Adventure

There is no doubt ample room in the undeveloped places of the earth for every adventurous spirit to find scope. By all means let those go who can. But the real way of escape from boredom and the tedium of life is not so much to widen our sphere or broaden our life's surface as to deepen it. It is depth and intensity of living which is the cure for *ennui.* Constant study is, of course, invaluable, and adult education in every branch of knowledge is necessary. The dismal error which makes youth fretful and inane is that, after leaving school or college, youth thinks it is unnecessary to study.

Not only is the acquisition of knowledge needed, but the use of imagination—a faculty which in so many has grown rusty or disused. To experience an adventure of the imagination, it is only necessary to go out on a starry night and try to think, if one dare, of the myriad worlds of space, and to form any sort of conception regarding the Great Creator whose fingers framed the heavens.

Still more, the deepening of life must be a thing of the heart. Deeper and wider sympathies, a conscience which is tender enough to revolt against injustice of every kind, a sense of burning shame for wrongs committed in our country's name, a pity for those who are staggering under the loads they carry or who are reeling from the cruel blows which fall on them in life. When the conviction comes to man or woman that they cannot enjoy their own comforts and happiness without

longing to share these with others less fortunate, or to bring the same joys within their reach, then life's adventure really begins for them. Their service may bring them, for the sake of others, into situations of novelty and danger besides which adventures in a novel pale.

Ruts and Grooves

It is a common failing of humanity to try to get through life as easily and quietly as possible, avoiding unpleasant, difficult or noxious things, the saddening or disturbing. Many people have no wish for the unusual or the adventurous. The great mass of people do not figure in public. Newspapers record only the unusual; they ignore the humdrum, the regular, the neutral, the commonplace and the virtuous. Their readers want to know only arresting novelties, the extraordinary, the surprises and accidents, the crimes, and the breaking of records. Newspapers have their eye on the adventurer and his exploits. But the steady, decent men or women, who move along in their even tenor of work, sleep and modest amusements, quarrelling with none, retiring in their disposition and regular in their habits, remain practically unnoticed. This is not to be regretted, but there is a certain snare and risk to themselves: they are prone to make their lives run in ruts and grooves.

It is interesting to watch the growth of custom. In childhood the mind is a blank page, but at once

it begins to be written upon. Lines begin to appear on the page, as thoughts take origin and impinge upon the mind. It is like a new-ploughed field, which is trackless until someone walks across it, leaving the first track, then hardened into a path as others follow along the same track. Thus ideas and thoughts traverse the mind, forming pathways which subsequent thoughts frequent, choosing the easy, beaten track.

In national life it is the same. History contains a record of tendencies and movements among peoples, the growth of beliefs, of discovery and of mental development. In the case of an ancient nation, rich in traditions, old customs and memories, the stream of its life rose in the high uplands of Time, and as it flowed it has grooved out deep channels in the lives of generations of men and women, in tribe or class. But in the case of a new nation founded in a colony overseas, men and women settlers group themselves into corporate life unencumbered by old traditions and customs, their new-found freedom inviting them to new methods and adventurous courses.

But the history of a nation, whether it be old or new, contains a record of certain notable occasions when men, or tribes, or factions, or whole nations, rose up out of the grooves into which their lives had grown, and spoke or acted so that the whole world stood still to listen. It may have been a lust to conquer or a vindication of honour. It may have been to strike a blow for freedom

against some tyrant, or to declare emancipation from some thraldom of the spirit or of social life. Every revolution in history is an adventure. Every war or military expedition, Luther's break with organized Christianity under the Roman Catholic Church, the French Revolution, the stand for religious freedom made by the Scottish Covenanters —all are adventures arresting and complete.

Probably the first of the earliest records of pure adventure was that recorded of Abraham, who by divine command went out from Mesopotamia *not knowing whither he went*. The call came and he answered it, as right down the ages men and women have heard the call, and set forth on pure adventure.

Adventure in Intellect

Man's life is shrouded in mystery. A very little indeed we have come to know, but around and beyond us there is an apparently impenetrable wall of darkness. Yet in these finite minds of ours has been implanted the hope and desire to know something of the Infinite. For thousands of years the search for knowledge has been widening, and we to-day inherit what of truth and knowledge previous generations have found. Like some will-o'-the-wisp, Truth has beckoned man onward and upward, and still onward and upward. It is as if the Almighty were giving out to men only such instalments of knowledge as they can usefully absorb, appreciate and apply. We get

glimpses the most fleeting and tantalizing into the Infinite. Every glimpse is the reward of years of toil and search.

It is by the adventurous souls that knowledge has been won. The daring pioneers have forged ahead of their fellows. It seems as if a whisper from beyond the stars had reached a human ear, saying: "Look there"; and he looks, and finds some treasure of thought. When he tells his friends, they call it a "scientific discovery." There are, what Isaiah the prophet told Cyrus of Persia he would find, "Treasures of Darkness." It is the seekers in the dark who find the treasures. There it falls to "The illustrious builders by whom this temple has been slowly reared since the infancy of mankind . . . to disclose ever more and more of the limitless beauty, harmonious order, and imperious laws that extend throughout the Universe."

The peaceful victories of the scientist "have done more for the enlightenment and progress of mankind than were ever achieved by the triumphs of war." Men have advanced in knowledge by Aristotle's inductive method explicitly formulated in scientific mould by Francis Bacon. Observations of facts are made; Reason sifts and arranges them; then Imagination comes into play, and a theory is set up which connects and describes the facts. Then Reason predicts or prophesies the existence of other facts, which again may be verified, and thus the sum of human knowledge grows.

Now it is the adventurer in thought who applies his imagination to establish a theory. He forges the link, he supplies the clue. Without him there would be no theory, and the mass of facts would remain unrelated and chaotic. So many of us are what Rabbi ben Ezra would call "Finished and finite clods, untroubled by a spark." But those who have the spark of adventure in them lead the world. These are the men who ask why? whence? whither?—and gallantly adventure, staking life and life's treasures in their search.

Adventure in Religion

Among the ideals of religious adventure there has been created none greater than that of the progress of Christian, the pilgrim whose journeyings to the Celestial City are faithfully and brilliantly told as genius trickled from the pen of John Bunyan.

In the diary of the soul there are noted daily and hourly adventures, whether we read the diary or not. Men and women, being moral beings, cannot live without adventure. All the decisions of life, including those which are known to be momentous, those which are trivial, and also those which appear trivial but are afterwards discovered to be momentous. Every act of faith is an adventure.

The day comes in all lives, whether soon or late, when men and women discover that they must take account of things unseen. Previously

they may have been trying to find anchorage in the material things of life or in its intellectual joys. But the anchor has been found to be dragging, and they come to realize that the only safe anchorage is in the Unseen. Having discovered this, they next discover God.

It will not do to admit merely as a fact or a doctrinal theory that the Unseen has to be reckoned with. It must be an experience, and here is where the greatest adventure of all comes in.

The divine terms mean all or nothing. They mean that we leave our old moorings and set out on a full tide. They mean putting our life absolutely in Divine guidance in the small and the great things of life, in the dog-days and the crises, in the wearying iteration of the unbearably common task as well as in the soul-racking, momentous decisions of life.

Adventures instantly emerge; for example, in denying ourselves harmful indulgences and separating ourselves from those in whose company we previously enjoyed them; in surrendering wealth, position, profitable concerns, lucrative chances, comforts, or even friendships, for the sake of high principle; or in beginning positively to do, for the sake of principle, things which turn upon us the finger of scorn, and nevertheless to continue doing them. The very first command is to stand by principle and abandon convenience, custom, personal comfort and conformity to the world's attitude to life.

Adventure

The so-called Christian life which has no adventure in it is but a poor imitation. The call, if loyally accepted, leads men and women into wholly unexpected places. It leads out upon an unknown sea of experience, in which men and women must encounter and fight gusts of passion, tornadoes of evil and cyclones from hell itself. No life can have religion which is worth the name without moral and spiritual adventure. Mere membership of a church organization is no substitute. Men and women cannot be Christians unless on terms of adventure. If they are to take their stand against evil outside of them, their way at once becomes dangerous and difficult. If they take their stand against the evil inclinations of their own hearts, equally are they at once in the midst of the maelstrom. If they set forth to influence others, to bring them within the same orbit as that in which they revolve, their whole ingenuity, persuasiveness, power of argument and constraint are called into play. Well may Paul have advised Timothy to put on the whole armour of God for such an adventure! Every moment is crowded with action in this spiritual warfare, the outcome of which is the building up of true Christian character and the redemption of the lives of men and women.

Books by S. P. B. Mais

An English Course for Everybody

Cr. 8vo. 6s.

"His enthusiasm is contagious . . . there is something irresistible about his pages. He believes that books should be enjoyed, and in this spirit he has written a most entertaining and unconventional volume."

Newcastle Chronicle.

Why We Should Read—

Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

"These stimulating and readable little chapters are delightful, and they are packed with information."

Tatler.

Some Modern Authors

Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

"The general reader will find his frank, familiar talks more helpful than stern, technical criticism could be."

British Weekly.

From Shakespeare to O'Henry

Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

"We are truly in the debt of Mr. Mais for these lively and stimulating essays."

Pall Mall Gazette.

Oh! to be in England

Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

"A more invigorating and cheery book it is impossible to imagine."

Sheffield Independent.

See England First

Cr. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

"An invigorating vitality inspired by a splendid joy of living rings through his pages."

Sunday Times.

The Richards Press Ltd.
90 Newman Street
London, W. 1

THE MODERN PICTORIAL LIBRARY

Edited by S. P. B. MAIS, M.A.

Size $9\frac{3}{4} \times 7$ *inches, sewed, coloured wrapper.* 1*s.*

Cloth binding, 2*s.*

Each volume contains from 60 *to* 120 *illustrations*

THE FOLLOWING TITLES ARE NOW READY:

1. LONDON by E. Beresford Chancellor, M.A., F.R.Hist.Soc.
2. FLYING by Lt.-Col. W. Lockwood Marsh, A.F.R.Ae.S.
3. SHAKESPEARE by S. P. B. Mais, M.A.
4. CATHEDRALS by George Sinclair
5. HISTORY OF ART by Louis Hourticq
6. ANIMALS OF THE WORLD by L. Joubin
7. DAWN OF BRITISH LITERATURE by S. P. B. Mais, M.A.
8. FRENCH REVOLUTION by A. Alba
9. HISTORY OF ENGLAND by Norman Sykes, M.A.
10. REMBRANDT by J. Laron
11. MYTHOLOGY by Ernest Granger
12. ELECTRICITY by S. E. Clotworthy, B.Sc. Hons.

A FEW EARLY OPINIONS:

Archbishop Davidson:
"The publication of such a series . . . must be of wide-spread interest and importance. I certainly learn a great deal myself from some of them."

The Bishop of London:
"He wishes you success in your venture."

Lord Burnham:
"I think 'The Modern Pictorial Library' quite delightful."

Edgar Wallace:
"They form a most fascinating series."

Field:
"Remarkably cheap . . . they do actually and truly succeed in squeezing a big subject into a small compass."